arXiv:1302.3412v2 [cs.IT] 27 Feb 2013

Secrecy capacities of compound quantum wiretap channels and applications

Holger Boche[§] Minglai Cai[*] Ning Cai[†]Christian Deppe[*]
[§]Lehrstuhl für Theoretische Informationstechnik, Technische Universität München, München, Germany,
boche@tum.de
[*]Department of Mathematics, University of Bielefeld, Bielefeld, Germany, {mlcai,cdeppe}@math.uni-bielefeld.de
[†]The State Key Laboratory of Integrated Services Networks, University of Xidian, Xian, China,
caining@mail.xidian.edu.cn

***Abstract*—We determine the secrecy capacity of the compound channel with quantum wiretapper and channel state information at the transmitter. Moreover, we derive a lower bound on the secrecy capacity of this channel without channel state information and determine the secrecy capacity of the compound classical-quantum wiretap channel with channel state information at the transmitter. We use this result to derive a new proof for a lower bound on the entanglement generating capacity of compound quantum channel. We also derive a new proof for the entanglement generating capacity of compound quantum channel with channel state information at the encoder.**

***Index Terms*—Compound channel; Wiretap channels; Quantum channels; Entanglement generation**

I. INTRODUCTION

Our goal is to analyze information transmission over a set of indexed channels, which is called a compound channel. The indices are referred as the channel states. Only one channel of this set is actually used for the information transmission, but the users cannot control which channel of the set will be used. The capacity of the compound channel was determined in [9]. A compound channel with an eavesdropper is called a compound wiretap channel. It is defined as a family of pairs of channels $\{(W_t, V_t) : t = 1, \cdots, T\}$ with common input alphabet and possibly different output alphabets, connecting a sender with two receivers, a legal and a wiretapper, where t stands for the state of the channel pair (W_t, V_t). The legitimate receiver accesses the output of the first channel W_t in the pair (W_t, V_t), and the wiretapper observes the output of the second part V_t in the pair (W_t, V_t), respectively, when a state t governs the channel. A code for the channel conveys information to the legal receiver such that the wiretapper's knowledge of the transmitted information can be keep sufficiently small. This is a generalization of Wyner's wiretap channel [29] to the case of multiple channel states. In [29] the author required that the wiretapper cannot detect the message, using a weak security criterion (cf. Remark 1).

We deal with two communication scenarios. In the first one, only the sender is informed about the index t, or in other words, he has CSI, where CSI is the abbreviation for "channel state information". In the second one, both the sender and the receiver does not have any information about that index at all.

The compound wiretap channels were introduced in [18]. A lower bound of the secrecy capacity under the condition that the sender does not have any knowledge about the CSI was obtained. In [18] the authors required that the receiver's average error goes to zero and the wiretapper can not detect the message, using the same security criterion as [29]. The result of [18] was improved in [8] by using a stronger condition for the limit of legitimate receiver's error, i.e., the maximal error should go to zero, as well as a stronger condition for the security criterion (c.f. Remark 1). Furthermore, the secrecy capacity for the case when the sender has knowledge about the CSI was determined.

In this paper we analyze two variants of the compound wiretap channel where quantum channels are used. A quantum channel can transmit both classical and quantum information. We consider the capacity of quantum channels to carry classical information. This is equivalently to consider the capacity of classical-quantum channels, where the classical-quantum channels are quantum channels whose sender's inputs are classical variables. In general there are two ways to represent a quantum channel with linear algebraic tools (cf. e.g. Section VII), either as a sum of several transformations, or as a single unitary transformation which explicitly includes the unobserved environment. We use the latter one for our result in the entanglement generating capacity. These two representations can both be used to determine the entanglement generating capacity for quantum channels, but it is unknown if this holds for the entanglement generating capacity of compound quantum channels. The classical capacity of quantum channels has been determined by Holevo in [15]. The first variant is called the classical compound channel with quantum wiretapper. In this channel model we assume that the wiretap channels are quantum channels, while the legal transmission channels are classical channels. The second variant is called the compound classical-quantum wiretap channel. In this channel model, we assume that both families of channels are quantum channels, while the sender transmits classical information. Our results are summarized as follows. Under the condition that the sender has knowledge about the CSI, the secrecy capacity for these two channel models are derived. Additionally, when the sender does not have any knowledge about the CSI, we determine the secrecy capacity of the compound classical-quantum wiretap channel, and give a lower bound for the secrecy capacity of the classical compound channel with quantum wiretapper.

As an application of the above results, we turn to the question, what is the maximal amount of entanglement, that we can generate or transmit over a given compound quantum channel. For the sender and the receiver, the objective is to share a nearly maximally entangled state on a $2^{nR} \times 2^{nR}$ dimensional Hilbert space by using a large number n instances of the compound quantum channel. Such quantum communication tasks are needed, for example, to support computation in quantum circuits or to provide the best possible supply of pure entanglement in a noisy environment. The entanglement generating capacity of quantum channel has been determined by in [13] and [4]. The entanglement generating capacities of compound quantum channel with and without CSI have been determined in [6] and [7]. In our paper we derive a lower bound on the entanglement generating capacity of compound quantum channel by using an alternative technique to the method in [6] and [7] (cf. Section VII). Furthermore, we derive the entanglement generating capacity of compound quantum channel with CSI at the encoder using the alternative technique.

The main definitions are given in Section II.

In Section III we present some known results for classical compound wiretap channel which are used for the proof of the results in Section IV.

In Section IV we discuss the classical compound channel with quantum wiretapper. For the case when the sender has the full knowledge about the CSI, we derive the secrecy capacity. For the case when the sender does not know the CSI, we give a lower bound for the secrecy capacity. In this channel model the wiretapper uses classical-quantum channels.

In Section V we derive the secrecy capacity of the compound classical-quantum wiretap channel with CSI. In this model both the receiver and the wiretapper use classical quantum channels and the set of the channel states may be finite or infinite.

In Section VI we use the results of Section V to derive a lower bound on the entanglement generating capacity for compound quantum channel. The entanglement generating capacity of compound quantum channel with CSI at the encoder is also derived.

In Section VII we discuss the two ways to represent a quantum channel with linear algebraic tools.

II. PRELIMINARIES

For finite sets A and B we define a (discrete) classical channel U: $A \rightarrow P(B)$, $A \ni x \rightarrow \mathsf{U}(x) \in P(B)$ to be a system characterized by a probability transition matrix $\mathsf{U}(\cdot|\cdot)$. Here $P(B)$ stands for the sets of probability distributions on B. For $x \in A$, $y \in B$, $\mathsf{U}(y|x)$ expresses the probability of the output symbol y when we send the symbol x through the channel. The channel is said to be memoryless if the probability distribution of the output depends only on the input at that time and is conditionally independent of previous channel inputs and outputs.

Let U^n stands for the n-th memoryless extension of the stochastic matrix U, i.e., for $x^n = (x_1, \cdots, x_n) \in A^n$ and $y^n = (y_1, \cdots, y_n) \in B^n$, $\mathsf{U}^n(y^n|x^n) = \prod_{i=1}^n \mathsf{U}(y_i|x_i)$ (cf. [27]).

For a discrete random variable X on A, and a discrete random variable Y on B, we denote the Shannon entropy by $H(X)$ and the mutual information between X and Y by $I(X;Y)$ (cf. [27]).

For a probability distribution Q on A, a conditional stochastic matrix Λ, and a positive constant δ, denote the set of typical sequences by $\mathcal{T}^n_{Q,\delta}$ and the set of conditionally typical sequences by $\mathcal{T}^n_{\Lambda,\delta}(x^n)$ (here we use the strong condition) (cf. [27]).

For finite-dimensional complex Hilbert spaces G and G' a quantum channel U: $\mathcal{S}(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(G')$, $\mathcal{S}(G) \ni \rho \rightarrow U(\rho) \in \mathcal{S}(G')$ is represented by a completely positive trace preserving map, which accepts input quantum states in $\mathcal{S}(G)$ and produces output quantum states in $\mathcal{S}(G')$. Here $\mathcal{S}(G)$ and $\mathcal{S}(G')$ stand for and the space of density operators on G', respectively.

If the sender wishes to transmit a classical message $m \in M$ to the receiver using a quantum channel, his encoding procedure will include a classical-to-quantum encoder $M \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(G)$ to prepare a quantum message state $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(G)$ suitably as input for the channel. If the sender's encoding is restricted to transmitting an indexed finite set of orthogonal quantum states $\{\rho_x : x \in A\} \subset \mathcal{S}(G)$, then we can consider the choice of the signal quantum states ρ_x to be a component of the channel. Thus, we obtain a channel with classical inputs $x \in A$ and quantum outputs: $\sigma_x := U(\rho_x)$, which we call a classical-quantum channel. This is a map $\mathtt{U}$: $A \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(G')$, $\mathfrak{X} \ni x \rightarrow \mathtt{U}(x) \in \mathcal{S}(G')$ which is represented by the set of $|A|$ possible output quantum states $\{\sigma_x = \mathtt{U}(x) := U(\rho_x) : x \in A\} \subset \mathcal{S}(G')$, meaning that each classical input of $x \in A$ leads to a distinct quantum output $\sigma_x \in \mathcal{S}(G')$.

Associate to U and $\mathtt{U}$ are the channel maps on n-block $U^{\otimes n}$: $\mathcal{S}(G^{\otimes n}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}({G'}^{\otimes n})$, and $\mathtt{U}^{\otimes n}$: $A^n \rightarrow \mathcal{S}({G'}^{\otimes n})$, such that for $\rho^{\otimes n} = \rho_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \rho_n \in \mathcal{S}(G^{\otimes n})$ and $x^n = (x_1, \cdots, x_n) \in A^n$, $U^{\otimes n}(\rho^{\otimes n}) = U(\rho_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes U(\rho_n)$, and $\mathtt{U}_t^{\otimes n}(x^n) = \mathtt{U}(x_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathtt{U}(x_n)$, respectively.

For a quantum state $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(G)$ denote the von Neumann entropy of ρ by

$$S(\rho) = -\mathrm{tr}(\rho \log \rho) \ .$$

Let $\mathfrak{P}$ and $\mathfrak{Q}$ be quantum systems, denote the Hilbert Space of $\mathfrak{P}$ and $\mathfrak{Q}$ by $G^{\mathfrak{P}}$ and $G^{\mathfrak{Q}}$, respectively. Let ϕ be a quantum state in $\mathcal{S}(G^{\mathfrak{PQ}})$, denote $\rho := \mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{Q}}(\phi) \in \mathcal{S}(G^{\mathfrak{P}})$, and $\sigma := \mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{P}}(\phi) \in \mathcal{S}(G^{\mathfrak{Q}})$. The conditional quantum entropy of σ given ρ is denote by

$$S(\sigma \mid \rho) := S(\phi) - S(\rho) \ .$$

For quantum states ρ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}(G)$ denote the fidelity of ρ and σ by

$$F(\rho, \sigma) := \|\sqrt{\rho}\sqrt{\sigma}\|_1^2 \ ,$$

where $\|\cdot\|_1$ is the l_1-norm for matrices.

For a quantum state $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(G)$ and a quantum channel U: $\mathcal{S}(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(G')$, the coherent information is defined as

$$I_C(\rho, U) := S(U(\rho)) - S\left((id_{G'} \otimes U)(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)\right) \ ,$$

where $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ is an arbitrary purification of ρ in $\mathcal{S}(G)\otimes\mathcal{S}(G')$. Let $\Phi := \{\rho_x : x \in \mathcal{A}\}$ be a set of quantum states labeled by elements of $\mathfrak{X}$. For a probability distribution Q on A, the Holevo χ quantity is defined as

$$\chi(Q;\Phi) := S\left(\sum_{x\in A} Q(x)\rho_x\right) - \sum_{x\in A} Q(x)S\left(\rho_x\right) \ .$$

For $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(H)$ and $\alpha > 0$ there exists an orthogonal subspace projector $\Pi_{\rho,\alpha}$ commuting with $\rho^{\otimes n}$ and satisfying

$$\operatorname{tr}\left(\rho^{\otimes n}\Pi_{\rho,\alpha}\right) \geq 1 - \frac{d}{4n\alpha^2} \ , \tag{1}$$

$$\operatorname{tr}\left(\Pi_{\rho,\alpha}\right) \leq 2^{nS(\rho)+Kd\alpha\sqrt{n}} \ , \tag{2}$$

$$\Pi_{\rho,\alpha} \cdot \rho^{\otimes n} \cdot \Pi_{\rho,\alpha} \leq 2^{-nS(\rho)+Kd\alpha\sqrt{n}}\Pi_{\rho,\alpha} \ , \tag{3}$$

where $d := \dim H$, and K is a positive constant.
For $P \in P(A)$, $\alpha > 0$ and $x^n \in \mathcal{T}_P^n$ there exists an orthogonal subspace projector $\Pi_{\mathtt{V},\alpha}(x^n)$ commuting with $\mathtt{V}_{x^n}^{\otimes n}$ and satisfying

$$\operatorname{tr}\left(\mathtt{V}^{\otimes n}(x^n)\Pi_{\mathtt{V},\alpha}(x^n)\right) \geq 1 - \frac{ad}{4n\alpha^2} \ , \tag{4}$$

$$\operatorname{tr}\left(\Pi_{\mathtt{V},\alpha}(x^n)\right) \leq 2^{nS(\mathtt{V}|P)+Kad\alpha\sqrt{n}} \ , \tag{5}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\Pi_{\mathtt{V},\alpha}(x^n) \cdot \mathtt{V}^{\otimes n}(x^n) \cdot \Pi_{\mathtt{V},\alpha}(x^n)\\ &\quad \leq 2^{-nS(\mathtt{V}|P)+Kad\alpha\sqrt{n}}\Pi_{\mathtt{V},\alpha}(x^n) \ ,\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

$$\operatorname{tr}\left(\mathtt{V}^{\otimes n}(x^n) \cdot \Pi_{P\mathtt{V},\alpha\sqrt{a}}\right) \geq 1 - \frac{ad}{4n\alpha^2} \ , \tag{7}$$

where $a := \#\{A\}$, and K is a positive constant (cf. [27]).

We denote the identity operator on a space G by id_G.

Let A, B, and C be finite sets. Let H, H', and H'' be complex Hilbert spaces. Let $\mathfrak{P}$ and $\mathfrak{Q}$ be quantum systems, denote the Hilbert Space of $\mathfrak{P}$ and $\mathfrak{Q}$ by $H^{\mathfrak{P}}$ and $H^{\mathfrak{Q}}$, respectively. Let $\theta := \{1, \cdots, T\}$ be a finite set. For every $t \in \theta$ let

W_t be a classical channel $A \to P(B)$;
V_t be a classical channel $A \to P(C)$;
$\mathtt{V}_t$ be a classical-quantum channel $A \to \mathcal{S}(H)$;
W_t be a quantum channel $\mathcal{S}(H') \to \mathcal{S}(H'')$;
V_t be a quantum channel $\mathcal{S}(H') \to \mathcal{S}(H)$;
N_t be a quantum channel $\mathcal{S}(H^{\mathfrak{P}}) \to \mathcal{S}(H^{\mathfrak{Q}})$.

We call the set of the classical channel pairs $(\mathsf{W}_t, \mathsf{V}_t)_{t\in\theta}$ a **(classical) compound wiretap channel**. When the channel state is t, and the sender inputs a sequence $x^n \in A^n$ into the channel, the receiver receives the output $y^n \in B^n$ with probability $\mathsf{W}_t^n(y^n|x^n)$, while the wiretapper receives the output $z^n \in Z^n$ with probability $\mathsf{V}_t^n(z^n|x^n)$.

We call the set of the classical channel/classical-quantum channel pairs $(\mathsf{W}_t, \mathtt{V}_t)_{t\in\theta}$ a **compound channel with quantum wiretapper**. When the channel state is t and the sender inputs a sequence $x^n \in A^n$ into the channel, the receiver receives the output $y^n \in B^n$ with probability $\mathsf{W}_t^n(y^n|x^n)$, while the wiretapper receives an output quantum state $\mathtt{U}_t^{\otimes n}(x^n) \in \mathcal{S}(H^{\otimes n})$.

We call the set of the quantum channel pairs $(W_t, V_t)_{t\in\theta}$ a **quantum compound wiretap channel**. When the channel state is t and the sender inputs a quantum state $\rho^{\otimes n} \in \mathcal{S}(H'^{\otimes n})$ into the channel, the receiver receives an output quantum state $W_t^{\otimes n}(\rho^{\otimes n}) \in \mathcal{S}(H''^{\otimes n})$, while the wiretapper receives an output quantum state $V_t^{\otimes n}(\rho^{\otimes n}) \in \mathcal{S}(H^{\otimes n})$.

We call the set of the quantum channel $(N_t)_{t\in\theta}$ a **quantum compound channel**. When the channel state is t and the sender inputs a quantum state $\rho^{\mathfrak{P}^n} \in \mathcal{S}(H^{\mathfrak{P}\otimes n})$ into the channel, the receiver receives an output quantum state $N_t^{\otimes n}(\rho^{\mathfrak{P}^n}) \in \mathcal{S}(H^{\mathfrak{Q}\otimes n})$.

We distinguish two different scenarios according to the sender's knowledge of the channel state:

- the sender has the CSI, i.e. he knows which t the channel state actually is,
- the sender does not have any CSI.

In both cases, we assume that the receiver does not have any CSI, but the wiretapper always has the full knowledge of the CSI. Of course we also have the case where both the sender and the receiver has the CSI, but this case is equivalent to the case when we only have one pair of channels (W_t, V_t), instead of a family of pairs of channels $\{(W_t, V_t) : t = 1, \cdots, T\}$.

An (n, J_n) code for the compound wiretap channel $(\mathsf{W}_t, \mathsf{V}_t)_{t\in\theta}$ consists of a stochastic encoder $E : \{1, \cdots, J_n\} \to P(A^n)$ specified by a matrix of conditional probabilities $E(\cdot|\cdot)$, and a collection of mutually disjoint sets $\{D_j \subset B^n : j \in \{1, \cdots, J_n\}\}$ (decoding sets).

If the sender has the CSI, then we may use the following strategy. For every $t \in \theta$ the sender and the receiver build an (n, J_n) code $(E_t, \{D_j : j = 1, \cdots, J_n\})$ such that all codes in $\Big\{(E_t, \{D_j : j = 1, \cdots, J_n\}) : t \in \theta\Big\}$ share the same decoding sets $\{D_j : j = 1, \cdots, J_n\}$, which do not depend on t, to transform the message, instead of use a single code for all t.

A non-negative number R is an achievable secrecy rate for the compound wiretap channel $(\mathsf{W}_t, \mathsf{V}_t)$ having CSI at the encoder, if for every positive ε, δ, every $t \in \theta$, and a sufficiently large n there is an (n, J_n) code $(E_t, \{D_j : j = 1, \cdots, J_n\})$, such that $\frac{1}{n}\log J_n \geq R - \delta$, and

$$\max_{t\in\theta} \max_{j\in\{1,\cdots,J_n\}} \sum_{x^n\in A^n} E_t(x^n|j)\mathsf{W}_t^n(D_j^c|x^n) \leq \varepsilon \ , \tag{8}$$

$$\max_{t\in\theta} I(X_{uni}; K_t^n) \leq \varepsilon \ , \tag{9}$$

where X_{uni} is a random variable uniformly distributed on $\{1, \cdots, J_n\}$, and K_t^n are the resulting random variables at the output of wiretap channels V_t^n. Here for a set Ξ, Ξ^c denotes its complement.

Remark 1: A weaker and widely used security criterion, e.g. in [18] (also cf. [29] for wiretap channel's security criterion), is obtained if we replace (9) with $\max_{t\in\theta}\frac{1}{n}I(X_{uni};K_t^n)\leq\varepsilon$. In this paper we will follow [8] and use (9).

A non-negative number R is an achievable secrecy rate for the compound wiretap channel $(\mathsf{W}_t,\mathsf{V}_t)$ having no CSI at the encoder, if for every positive ε, δ and a sufficiently large n there is an (n,J_n) code $(E,\{D_j : j=1,\cdots,J_n\})$ such that $\frac{1}{n}\log J_n\geq R-\delta$, and

$$\max_{t\in\theta}\max_{j\in\{1,\cdots,J_n\}}\sum_{x^n\in A^n}E(x^n|j)\mathsf{W}_t^n(D_j^c|x^n)\leq\varepsilon\ , \tag{10}$$

$$\max_{t\in\theta}I(X_{uni};K_t^n)\leq\varepsilon\ . \tag{11}$$

An (n,J_n) code for the compound channel with quantum wiretapper $(\mathsf{W}_t,\mathtt{V}_t)_{t\in\theta}$ consists of a stochastic encoder $E:\{1,\cdots,J_n\}\to P(A^n)$ and a collection of mutually disjoint sets $\{D_j\subset B^n : j\in\{1,\cdots,J_n\}\}$ (decoding sets).

A non-negative number R is an achievable secrecy rate for the compound channel with quantum wiretapper $(\mathsf{W}_t,\mathtt{V}_t)_{t\in\theta}$ having CSI at the encoder, if for every positive ε, δ, every $t\in\theta$, and a sufficiently large n, there is an (n,J_n) code $(E_t,\{D_j : j=1,\cdots,J_n\})$ such that $\frac{1}{n}\log J_n\geq R-\delta$, and

$$\max_{t\in\theta}\max_{j\in\{1,\cdots,J_n\}}\sum_{x^n\in A^n}E_t(x^n|j)\mathsf{W}_t^n(D_j^c|x^n)\leq\varepsilon\ , \tag{12}$$

$$\max_{t\in\theta}\chi(X_{uni};Z_t^{\otimes n})\leq\varepsilon\ . \tag{13}$$

Here Z_t^n are the resulting quantum states at the output of wiretap channels $\mathtt{V}_t^n$.

A non-negative number R is an achievable secrecy rate for the compound channel with quantum wiretapper $(\mathsf{W}_t,\mathtt{V}_t)_{t\in\theta}$ having no CSI at the encoder, if for every positive ε, δ and a sufficiently large n, there is an (n,J_n) code $(E,\{D_j : j=1,\cdots,J_n\})$ such that $\frac{1}{n}\log J_n\geq R-\delta$, and

$$\max_{t\in\theta}\max_{j\in\{1,\cdots,J_n\}}\sum_{x^n\in A^n}E(x^n|j)\mathsf{W}_t^n(D_j^c|x^n)\leq\varepsilon\ , \tag{14}$$

$$\max_{t\in\theta}\chi(X_{uni};Z_t^{\otimes n})\leq\varepsilon\ . \tag{15}$$

An (n,J_n) code carrying classical information for the compound quantum wiretap channel $(W_t,V_t)_{t\in\theta}$ consists of a family of vectors $w:=\{w(j) : j=1,\cdots,J_n\}\subset\mathcal{S}(H'^{\otimes n})$ and a collection of positive semi-definite operators $\{D_j : j\in\{1,\cdots,J_n\}\}\subset\mathcal{S}(H''^{\otimes n})$ which is a partition of the identity, i.e. $\sum_{j=1}^{J_n}D_j=id_{H''^{\otimes n}}$.

A non-negative number R is an achievable secrecy rate with classical input for the compound quantum wiretap channel $(W_t,V_t)_{t\in\theta}$ having CSI at the encoder with average error, if for every positive ε, δ, every $t\in\theta$, and a sufficiently large n, there is an (n,J_n) code carrying classical information $(w_t:=\{w_t(j) : j\},\{D_j : j\})$ such that $\frac{1}{n}\log J_n\geq R-\delta$, and

$$\max_{t\in\theta}\frac{1}{J_n}\sum_{j=1}^{J_n}\operatorname{tr}\left(id_{H''^{\otimes n}}-W_t^{\otimes n}\left(w_t(j)\right)D_j\right)\leq\varepsilon\ , \tag{16}$$

$$\max_{t\in\theta}\chi(X_{uni};Z_t^{\otimes n})\leq\varepsilon\ . \tag{17}$$

A non-negative number R is an achievable secrecy rate with classical input for the compound quantum wiretap channel $(W_t,V_t)_{t\in\theta}$ having no CSI at the encoder, if for every positive ε, δ, and a sufficiently large n, there is an (n,J_n) code carrying classical information $(w:=\{w(j) : j\},\{D_j : j\})$ such that $\frac{1}{n}\log J_n\geq R-\delta$, and

$$\max_{t\in\theta}\max_{j\in\{1,\cdots,J_n\}}\operatorname{tr}\left(id_{H''^{\otimes n}}-W_t^{\otimes n}\left(w(j)\right)D_j\right)\leq\varepsilon\ , \tag{18}$$

$$\max_{t\in\theta}\chi(X_{uni};Z_t^{\otimes n})\leq\varepsilon\ . \tag{19}$$

Instead of “ achievable secrecy rate with classical input for the compound quantum wiretap channel ”, we say R is an achievable secrecy rate for the compound classical-quantum wiretap channel $(W_t,V_t)_{t\in\theta}$.

An (n,J_n) code carrying quantum information for the compound quantum channel $\left(N_t^{\otimes n}\right)_{t\in\theta}$ consists of a Hilbert spaces $H^{\mathfrak{A}}$ such that $\dim H^{\mathfrak{A}}=J_n$, and a general decoding quantum operation D, i.e. a completely positive, trace preserving map $D:\mathcal{S}(H^{\mathfrak{Q}^n})\to\mathcal{S}(H^{\mathfrak{M}})$, where $H^{\mathfrak{M}}$ is a Hilbert space such that $\dim H^{\mathfrak{M}}=J_n$. The code can be used for the entanglement generating in the following way. The sender prepares a pure bipartite quantum state $|j\rangle^{\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{P}^n}$, defined on $H^{\mathfrak{A}}\otimes H^{\mathfrak{P}^n}$, and sends the $\mathfrak{P}^n$ portion of it through the channel $N_t^{\otimes n}$. The receiver performs the general decoding quantum operation on the channel output $D:\mathcal{S}(H^{\mathfrak{Q}^n})\to\mathcal{S}(H^{\mathfrak{M}})$. The sender and the receiver share the resulting quantum state

$$\Omega_t^{\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{M}}:=[id^{\mathfrak{A}}\otimes(D\circ N_t^{\otimes n})]\left(|j\rangle\langle j|^{\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{P}^n}\right)\ . \tag{20}$$

A non-negative number R is an achievable entanglement generating rate for the compound quantum channel $\left(N_t^{\otimes n}\right)_{t\in\theta}$ if for every positive ε, δ, and and a sufficiently large n, there is an (n,J_n) code carrying quantum information $\left(H^{\mathfrak{A}},D\right)$ such that $\frac{1}{n}\log J_n\geq R-\delta$, and

$$\min_{t\in\theta}F\left(\Omega_t^{\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{M}},|\Phi_K\rangle\langle\Phi_K|^{\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{M}}\right)\geq1-\varepsilon\ , \tag{21}$$

where

$$|\Phi_K\rangle^{\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{M}}:=\sqrt{\frac{1}{J_n}}\sum_{j=1}^{J_n}|j\rangle^{\mathfrak{A}}|j\rangle^{\mathfrak{M}}\ ,$$

which is the standard maximally entangled state shared by the sender and the receiver. $\{|j\rangle^{\mathfrak{A}}\}$ and $\{|j\rangle^{\mathfrak{M}}\}$ are orthonormal bases for $H^{\mathfrak{A}}$ and $H^{\mathfrak{M}}$, respectively.

The largest achievable secrecy rate is called the secrecy capacity. The largest achievable entanglement generating rate is called the entanglement generating capacity

III. CLASSICAL COMPOUND WIRETAP CHANNELS

Let A, B, C, θ, and $(\mathsf{W}_t, \mathsf{V}_t)_{t\in\theta}$ be defined as in Section II. For every $t \in \theta$ fix a probability distribution p_t on A^n. Let
$$p_t'(x^n) := \begin{cases} \frac{p_t^n(x^n)}{p_t^n(\mathcal{T}^n_{p_t,\delta})} \ , & \text{if } x^n \in \mathcal{T}^n_{p_t,\delta} \\ 0 \ , & \text{else} \end{cases}$$
and $X^{(t)} := \{X_{j,l}^{(t)}\}_{j\in\{1,\cdots,J_n\}, l\in\{1,\cdots,L_{n,t}\}}$, be a family of random matrices whose entries are i.i.d. according to p_t', where $L_{n,t}$ is a nature number, which will be specified later.

It was shown in [8] that for any $\omega > 0$, if we set
$$J_n = \lfloor 2^{n(\min_{t\in\theta}(I(p_t;\mathsf{W}_t)-\frac{1}{n}\log L_{n,t}-\mu)} \rfloor \ ,$$
where μ is a positive constant which does not depend on j, t, and can be arbitrarily small when ω goes to 0, then there are such $\{D_j : j = 1, \cdots, J_n\}$ that for all $t \in \theta$ and for all $L_{n,t} \in \mathbb{N}$
$$Pr\left(\max_{j\in\{1,\cdots,J_n\}} \sum_{l=1}^{L_{n,t}} \frac{1}{L_{n,t}} \mathsf{W}_t^n(D_j^c|X_{j,l}^{(t)}) > \sqrt{T}2^{-n\omega/2}\right) \leq \sqrt{T}2^{-n\omega/2} \ . \quad (22)$$
Since here only the error of the legitimate receiver is analyzed, for the result (22) just the channels W_t, but not those of the wiretapper, are regarded. Here for every $j \in \{1, \cdots, J_n\}$, $l \in \{1, \cdots, L_{n,t}\}$, and $t \in \theta$, $\mathsf{W}_t^n(D_j^c|X_{j,l}^{(t)})$ is a random variable taking value in $]0, 1[$, which depends on $X_{j,l}^{(t)}$, since we defined $X_{j,l}^{(t)}$ as a random variable with value in A^n.

In view of (22), by choosing $L_{n,t} = \left\lfloor 2^{n[I(p_t;V_t)+\frac{\tau}{4}]}\right\rfloor$, the authors of [8] showed that $C_{S,CSI}$, the secrecy capacity of the compound wiretap channel with CSI at the transmitter is given by
$$C_{S,CSI} = \min_{t\in\theta} \max_{\mathcal{U}\to A\to(BK)_t} (I(\mathcal{U}; B_t) - I(\mathcal{U}; K_t)) \ , \quad (23)$$
where B_t are the resulting random variables at the output of legal receiver channels. K_t are the resulting random variables at the output of wiretap channels. The maximum is taken over all random variables that satisfy the Markov chain relationships: $\mathcal{U} \to A \to (BZ)_t$.

Analogously, in case without CSI, the idea is similar to the case with CSI: Fix a probability distribution p on A^n. Let
$$p'(x^n) := \begin{cases} \frac{p^n(x^n)}{p^n(\mathcal{T}^n_{p,\delta})} & \text{if } x^n \in \mathcal{T}^n_{p,\delta} \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$
and $X^n := \{X_{j,l}\}_{j\in\{1,\cdots,J_n\}, l\in\{1,\cdots,L_n\}}$, where L_n is a natural number, which will be specified later, be a family of random matrices whose components are i.i.d. according to p'.

For any $\omega > 0$, define
$$J_n = \lfloor 2^{n(\min_{t\in\theta}(I(p;\mathsf{W}_t)-\frac{1}{n}\log L_n-\mu)} \rfloor \ ,$$
where μ is a positive constant which does not depend on j and t, and can be arbitrarily small when ω goes to 0, then there are such $\{D_j : j = 1, \cdots, J_n\}$ that for all $t \in \theta$ and for all $L_n \in \mathbb{N}$
$$Pr\left(\max_{j\in\{1,\cdots,J_n\}} \sum_{l=1}^{L_n} \frac{1}{L_n} \mathsf{W}_t^n(D_j^c|X_{j,l}) > \sqrt{T}2^{-n\omega/2}\right) \leq \sqrt{T}2^{-n\omega/2} \ . \quad (24)$$

In view of (24), by choosing $L_n = \left\lfloor 2^{n[\max_t I(p_t;V_t)+\frac{\tau}{4}]}\right\rfloor$, the authors of [8] showed that C_S, the secrecy capacity of the compound wiretap channel without CSI at the transmitter, is lower bounded as follows
$$C_S \geq \max_{\mathcal{U}\to A\to(BK)_t} (\min_{t\in\theta} I(\mathcal{U}; B_t) - \max_{t\in\theta} I(\mathcal{U}; K_t)) \ . \quad (25)$$

IV. COMPOUND CHANNELS WITH QUANTUM WIRETAPPER

Let A, B, H, θ, and $(\mathsf{W}_t, \mathtt{V}_t)_{t\in\theta}$ be defined as in Section II.

Theorem 1: The secrecy capacity of the compound channel with quantum wiretapper $(\mathsf{W}_t, \mathtt{V}_t)_{t\in\theta}$ in the case with CSI at the transmitter $C_{S,CSI}$ is given by
$$C_{S,CSI} = \min_{t\in\theta} \max_{\mathcal{U}\to A\to(BZ)_t} (I(\mathcal{U}; B_t) - \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\chi(\mathcal{U}; Z_t^{\otimes n})) \ . \quad (26)$$
Respectively, in the case without CSI, the secrecy capacity of the compound channel with quantum wiretapper $(\mathsf{W}_t, \mathtt{V}_t)_{t\in\theta}$ C_S is lower bounded as follows
$$C_S \geq \max_{\mathcal{U}\to A\to(BZ)_t} (\min_{t\in\theta} I(\mathcal{U}; B_t) - \max_t \chi(\mathcal{U}; Z_t)) \ , \quad (27)$$
where B_t are the resulting random variables at the output of legal receiver channels, and Z_t are the resulting random quantum states at the output of wiretap channels.

Remark 2: We have only the multi-letter formulas (26) and (27), since we don't have a single-letter formula even for a quantum channel which is neither compound nor has wiretappers.

Proof: 1) Lower bound for case with CSI

For every $t \in \theta$, fix a probability distribution p_t on A^n. Let
$$J_n = \lfloor 2^{n(\min_{t\in\theta}(I(p_t;\mathsf{W}_t)-\frac{1}{n}\log L_{n,t}-\mu)} \rfloor \ ,$$
where $L_{n,t}$ is a natural number that will be specified below. Let p_t', $X^{(t)}$, and D_j be defined as in the classical case. Then (22) still holds since the sender transmits through a classical channel to the legitimate receiver.

Let
$$Q_t(x^n) := \Pi_{p_t\mathtt{V}_t,\alpha\sqrt{a}}\Pi_{\mathtt{V}_t,\alpha}(x^n)\cdot\mathtt{V}_t^{\otimes n}(x^n)\cdot\Pi_{\mathtt{V}_t,\alpha}(x^n)\Pi_{p_t\mathtt{V}_t,\alpha\sqrt{a}} \ ,$$
where α will be defined later.

Lemma 1 ([28]): Let ρ be a quantum state and X be a positive operator with $X \leq id$ and $1 - \mathrm{tr}(\rho X) \leq \lambda \leq 1$. Then
$$\|\rho - \sqrt{X}\rho\sqrt{X}\| \leq \sqrt{8\lambda} \ . \quad (28)$$

In view of the fact that $\Pi_{p_t\mathtt{V}_t,\alpha\sqrt{a}}$ and $\Pi_{\mathtt{V}_t,\alpha}(x^n)$ are both projection matrices, by (1), (7), and Lemma 1 for any t and x^n it holds that
$$\|Q_t(x^n) - \mathtt{V}_t^{\otimes n}(x^n)\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{2(ad + d)}{n\alpha^2}} \ . \quad (29)$$

We set $\Theta_t := \sum_{x^n\in\mathcal{T}^n_{p_t,\delta}} p'^n_t(x^n)Q_t(x^n)$. For given z^n and t, $\langle z^n|\Theta_t|z^n\rangle$ is the expected value of $\langle z^n|Q_t(x^n)|z^n\rangle$ under the condition $x^n \in \mathcal{T}^n_{p_t,\delta}$.

Lemma 2 ([2]): Let $\mathcal{V}$ be a finite dimensional Hilbert space. Let $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{V})$ be a collection of density operators such that $\sigma \leq \mu \cdot id_{\mathcal{V}}$ for all $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}$, and let p be a probability distribution on on $\mathcal{E}$. For any positive λ define a sequence of i.i.d. random variables $X_1, \cdots, X_L$ taking values in $\mathcal{E}$ such that for all $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}$, we have $p(\sigma) = Pr\left\{X_i = \Pi'_{\rho,\lambda} \cdot \sigma \cdot \Pi'_{\rho,\lambda}\right\}$, where $\rho := \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}} p(\sigma)\sigma$, and $\Pi'_{\rho,\lambda}$ is the projector onto the subspace spanned by the eigenvectors of ρ whose corresponding eigenvalues are greater than $\frac{\lambda}{\dim \mathcal{V}}$. For any $\epsilon \in]0,1[$, the following inequity holds

$$\begin{aligned}
&Pr\left(\|L^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{L} X_i - \Pi'_{\rho,\lambda} \cdot \rho \cdot \Pi'_{\rho,\lambda}\| > \epsilon\right) \\
&\leq 2 \cdot (\dim \mathcal{V})\text{exp}\left(-L\frac{\epsilon^2 \lambda}{2\ln 2(\dim \mathcal{V})\mu}\right) \ . \qquad (30)
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathcal{V}$ be the range space of $\Pi_{p_t\mathtt{V}_t,\alpha\sqrt{a}}$. By (2) we have

$$\dim \mathcal{V} \leq 2^{nS(p_t)+Kd\alpha\sqrt{an}} \ .$$

Furthermore, for all x^n

$$\begin{aligned}
&Q_t(x^n) \\
&= \Pi_{p_t\mathtt{V}_t,\alpha\sqrt{a}}\Pi_{\mathtt{V}_t,\alpha}(x^n) \cdot \mathtt{V}_t^{\otimes n}(x^n) \cdot \Pi_{\mathtt{V}_t,\alpha}(x^n)\Pi_{p_t\mathtt{V}_t,\alpha\sqrt{a}} \\
&\leq 2^{-n(S(\mathtt{V}_t|p_t)+Kad\alpha\sqrt{n})}\Pi_{p_t\mathtt{V}_t,\alpha\sqrt{a}}\Pi_{\mathtt{V}_t,\alpha}(x^n)\Pi_{p_t\mathtt{V}_t,\alpha\sqrt{a}} \\
&\leq 2^{-n\cdot S(\mathtt{V}_t|p_t)+Kad\alpha\sqrt{n}} \cdot \Pi_{p_t\mathtt{V}_t,\alpha\sqrt{a}} \\
&\leq 2^{-n\cdot S(\mathtt{V}_t|p_t)+Kad\alpha\sqrt{n}} \cdot id_{\mathcal{V}} \ . \qquad (31)
\end{aligned}$$

The first inequality follows from (6). The second inequality holds because $\Pi_{\mathtt{V}_t,\alpha}$ and $\Pi_{p_t\mathtt{V}_t,\alpha\sqrt{a}}$ are projection matrices. The third inequality holds because $\Pi_{p_t\mathtt{V}_t,\alpha\sqrt{a}}$ is a projection matrix onto $\mathcal{V}$.

Let $\lambda = \epsilon$, by applying Lemma 2, where we set $\mu := 2^{-n\cdot S(\mathtt{V}_t|p_t)+Kad\alpha\sqrt{n}}$ in (30) in view of (31), if n is large enough we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&Pr\left(\|\sum_{l=1}^{L_{n,t}} \frac{1}{L_{n,t}} Q_t(X_{j,l}) - \Theta_t\| > \epsilon\right) \\
&\leq 2^{n(S(p_t)+Kd\alpha\sqrt{an})} \qquad (32) \\
&\cdot \text{exp}\left(-L_{n,t}\frac{\epsilon^2}{2\ln 2}\lambda \cdot 2^{n(S(\mathtt{V}_t|p_t)-S(p_t))+Kd\alpha\sqrt{n}(\sqrt{a}-1)}\right) \\
&= 2^{n(S(p_t)+Kd\alpha\sqrt{an})} \\
&\cdot \text{exp}\left(-L_{n,t}\frac{\epsilon^2}{2\ln 2}\lambda \cdot 2^{n(-\chi(p_t;Z_t))+Kd\alpha\sqrt{n}(\sqrt{a}-1)}\right) \\
&\leq \text{exp}\left(-L_{n,t} \cdot 2^{-n(\chi(p_t;Z_t)+\zeta)}\right) \ , \qquad (33)
\end{aligned}$$

where ζ is some suitable positive constant, which does not depend on j, t, and can be arbitrarily small when ϵ is close to 0. The equality in the last line holds since

$$\begin{aligned}
&S(p_t) - S(\mathtt{V}_t|p_t) \\
&= S\left(\sum_j p_t(j)\sum_l \frac{1}{L_{n,t}}\mathtt{V}_t^{\otimes n}(X_{j,l}^{(t)})\right) \\
&- \sum_j p_t(j) S\left(\sum_l \frac{1}{L_{n,t}}\mathtt{V}_t^{\otimes n}(X_{j,l}^{(t)})\right) \\
&= \chi(p_t;Z_t) \ .
\end{aligned}$$

Let $L_{n,t} = \lceil 2^{n(\chi(p_t;Z_t)+2\zeta)}\rceil$, and n be large enough, then by (33) for all j it holds that

$$Pr\left(\|\sum_{l=1}^{L_{n,t}} \frac{1}{L_{n,t}} Q_t(X_{j,l}^{(t)}) - \Theta_t\| > \epsilon\right) \leq \text{exp}(-2^{n\zeta}) \qquad (34)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&Pr\left(\|\sum_{l=1}^{L_{n,t}} \frac{1}{L_{n,t}} Q_t(X_{j,l}^{(t)}) - \Theta_t\| \leq \epsilon \ \forall t \ \forall j\right) \\
&= 1 - Pr\left(\bigcup_t\bigcup_j\{\|\sum_{l=1}^{L_{n,t}} \frac{1}{L_{n,t}} Q_t(X_{j,l}^{(t)}) - \Theta_t\| > \epsilon\}\right) \\
&\geq 1 - TJ_n\text{exp}(-2^{n\zeta}) \\
&\geq 1 - T2^{n(\min_{t\in\theta}(I(p_t;\mathsf{W}_t)-\frac{1}{n}\log L_{n,t})}\text{exp}(-2^{n\zeta}) \\
&\geq 1 - 2^{-n\upsilon} \ , \qquad (35)
\end{aligned}$$

where υ is some positive suitable constant which does not depend on j and t.

Remark 3: Since exp$(-2^{n\zeta})$ converges to zero double exponentially fast, the inequality (35) remains true even if T depends on n and is exponentially large over n, i.e., we can still achieve exponentially small error.

From (22) and (35) it follows: For any $\epsilon > 0$, if n is large enough then the event

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\bigcap_t\left\{\max_{j\in\{1,\cdots,J_n\}}\sum_{l=1}^{L_{n,t}}\frac{1}{L_{n,t}}\mathsf{W}_t^n(D_j^c(\mathcal{X})|X_{j,l}^{(t)}) \leq \epsilon\right\}\right) \\
&\cap \left(\left\{\|\sum_{l=1}^{L_{n,t}} \frac{1}{L_{n,t}} Q_t(X_{j,l}^{(t)}) - \Theta_t\| \leq \epsilon \ \forall t \ \forall j\right\}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

has a positive probability. This means that we can find a realization $x_{j,l}^{(t)}$ of $X_{j,l}^{(t)}$ with a positive probability such that for all $t \in \theta$ and $j \in \{1,\cdots,J_n\}$, we have

$$\sum_{l=1}^{L_{n,t}} \frac{1}{L_{n,t}} \mathsf{W}_t^n(D_j^c|x_{j,l}^{(t)}) \leq \epsilon \ , \qquad (36)$$

and

$$\|\sum_{l=1}^{L_{n,t}} \frac{1}{L_{n,t}} Q_t(x_{j,l}^{(t)}) - \Theta_t\| \leq \epsilon \ . \qquad (37)$$

For an arbitrary $\gamma > 0$ let

$$R := \min_{t\in\theta}\max_{\mathcal{U}\rightarrow A\rightarrow(BZ)_t}(I(\mathcal{U};B_t) - \chi(\mathcal{U};Z_t)) - \gamma \ .$$

Choose $\mu < \frac{1}{2}\gamma$, then for every $t \in \theta$, there is an (n, J_n) code $\Big((x^{(t)}_{j,l})_{j=1,\cdots,J_n,l=1,\cdots,L_{n,t}}, \{D_j : j = 1, \cdots, J_n\}\Big)$ such that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log J_n \geq R\ , \tag{38}$$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \max_{t\in\theta} \max_{j\in\{1,\cdots,J_n\}} \sum_{l=1}^{L_{n,t}} \frac{1}{L_{n,t}} \mathsf{W}_t^n(D_j^c|x^{(t)}_{j,l}) = 0\ . \tag{39}$$

Choose a sufficiently α in (29) such that for all j, it holds $\|\mathtt{V}_t^{\otimes n}(x^{(t)}_{j,l}) - Q_t(x^{(t)}_{j,l})\| < \epsilon$. For any given $j' \in \{1, \cdots, J_n\}$, (29) and (37) yield

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\sum_{l=1}^{L_{n,t}} \frac{1}{L_{n,t}} \mathtt{V}_t^{\otimes n}(x^{(t)}_{j',l}) - \Theta_t\| \\
&\leq \|\sum_{l=1}^{L_{n,t}} \frac{1}{L_{n,t}} \mathtt{V}_t^{\otimes n}(x^{(t)}_{j',l}) - \sum_{l=1}^{L_{n,t}} \frac{1}{L_{n,t}} Q_t(x^{(t)}_{j',l})\| \\
&+ \|\sum_{l=1}^{L_{n,t}} \frac{1}{L_{n,t}} Q_t(x^{(t)}_{j',l}) - \Theta_t\| \\
&\leq \sum_{l=1}^{L_{n,t}} \frac{1}{L_{n,t}} \|\mathtt{V}_t^{\otimes n}(x^{(t)}_{j',l}) - Q_t(x^{(t)}_{j',l})\| \\
&+ \|\sum_{l=1}^{L^{(t)}_{n,t}} \frac{1}{L_{n,t}} Q_t(x^{(t)}_{j',l}) - \Theta_t\| \\
&\leq 2\epsilon\ ,
\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

and $\| \sum_{j=1}^{J_n} \frac{1}{J_n} \sum_{l=1}^{L_{n,t}} \frac{1}{L_{n,t}} \mathtt{V}_t^{\otimes n}(x^{(t)}_{j,l}) - \Theta_t \| \leq \epsilon$.

Lemma 3 (Fannes inequality (cf. [28])): Let Φ and Ψ be two quantum states in a d-dimensional complex Hilbert space and $\|\Phi - \Psi\| \leq \mu < \frac{1}{e}$, then

$$|S(\Phi) - S(\Psi)| \leq \mu \log d - \mu \log \mu\ . \tag{41}$$

By Lemma 3 and the inequality (40), for a uniformly distributed distributed random variable X_{uni} with value in $\{1, \cdots, J_n\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\chi(X_{uni}; Z_t^{\otimes n}) \\
&= S\left(\sum_{j=1}^{J_n} \frac{1}{J_n} \sum_{l=1}^{L_{n,t}} \frac{1}{L_{n,t}} \mathtt{V}_t^{\otimes n}(x^{(t)}_{j,l})\right) \\
&- \sum_{j=1}^{J_n} \frac{1}{J_n} S\left(\sum_{l=1}^{L_{n,t}} \frac{1}{L_{n,t}} \mathtt{V}_t^{\otimes n}(x^{(t)}_{j,l})\right) \\
&\leq \left| S\left(\sum_{j=1}^{J_n} \frac{1}{J_n} \sum_{l=1}^{L_{n,t}} \frac{1}{L_{n,t}} \mathtt{V}_t^{\otimes n}(x^{(t)}_{j,l})\right) - S\left(\Theta_t\right) \right| \\
&+ \left| S(\Theta_t) - \sum_{j=1}^{J_n} \frac{1}{J_n} S\left(\sum_{l=1}^{L_{n,t}} \frac{1}{L_{n,t}} \mathtt{V}_t^{\otimes n}(x^{(t)}_{j,l})\right) \right| \\
&\leq \epsilon \log d - \epsilon \log \epsilon \\
&+ \left| \sum_{j=1}^{J_n} \frac{1}{J_n} \left[S(\Theta_t) - S\left(\sum_{l=1}^{L_{n,t}} \frac{1}{L_{n,t}} \mathtt{V}_t^{\otimes n}(x^{(t)}_{j,l})\right) \right] \right| \\
&\leq 3\epsilon \log d - \epsilon \log \epsilon - 2\epsilon \log 2\epsilon\ .
\end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

By (42), for any positive λ if n is sufficiently large, we have

$$\max_{t\in\theta} \chi(X_{uni}; Z_t^{\otimes n}) \leq \lambda\ . \tag{43}$$

For every $t \in \theta$ we define an (n, J_n) code $(E_t, \{D_j : j = 1, \cdots, J_n\})$, where E_t is so build that $Pr\left(E_t(j) = x^{(t)}_{j,l}\right) = \frac{1}{L_{n,t}}$ for $l \in \{1, \cdots, L_{n,t}\}$. Combining (39) and (43) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&C_{S,CSI} \geq \min_{t\in\theta} \max_{\mathcal{U}\to A\to(BZ)_t} (I(\mathcal{U}; B_t) - \chi(\mathcal{U}; Z_t)) \\
&\geq \min_{t\in\theta} \max_{\mathcal{U}\to A\to(BZ)_t} (I(\mathcal{U}; B_t) - \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \chi(\mathcal{U}; Z_t^{\otimes n}))\ .
\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

Thus, we have shown the "$\geq$" part of (26).

2) Upper bound for case with CSI

Let $(\mathcal{C}_n)$ be a sequence of (n, J_n) code such that

$$\max_{t\in\theta} \max_{j\in\{1,\cdots,J_n\}} \sum_{x^n\in A^n} E(x^n|j) \mathsf{W}_t^n(D_j^c|x^n) =: \epsilon_{1,n}\ , \tag{45}$$

$$\max_{t\in\theta} \chi(J; Z_t^{\otimes n}) =: \epsilon_{2,n}\ , \tag{46}$$

where $\lim_{n\to\infty} \epsilon_{1,n} = 0$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} \epsilon_{2,n} = 0$, J denotes the random variable which is uniformly distributed on the message set $\{1, \ldots, J_n\}$.

Denote the security capacity of the wiretap channel $(\mathsf{W}_t, \mathtt{V}_t)$ in the sense of [27] by $C(\mathsf{W}_t, \mathtt{V}_t)$. Choose $t' \in \theta$ such that $C(\mathsf{W}_{t'}, \mathtt{V}_{t'}) = \min_{t\in\theta} C(\mathsf{W}_t, \mathtt{V}_t)$.

It is known (cf. [20]) that even in the case without wiretapper (we have only one classical channel $\mathsf{W}_{t'}$), the capacity cannot exceed $I(X_{uni}; B_{t'}) + \xi$ for any constant $\xi > 0$. Thus for any $\epsilon > 0$ choose $\xi = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon$, then the capacity of a classical channel with quantum wiretapper $(\mathsf{W}_{t'}, \mathtt{V}_{t'})$ cannot be greater than

$$\begin{aligned}
&I(X_{uni};B_{t'})+\xi \\
&\leq [I(X_{uni};B_{t'})-\limsup_{n\to\infty}\chi(X_{uni};Z_{t'}^{\otimes n})]+\xi+\epsilon_{2,n} \\
&\leq [I(X_{uni};B_{t'})-\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\chi(X_{uni};Z_{t'}^{\otimes n})]+\epsilon\ .
\end{aligned}$$

Since we cannot exceed the secrecy capacity of the worst wiretap channel, we have

$$C_{S,CSI}\leq \min_{t\in\theta}\max_{\mathcal{U}\to A\to(BZ)_t}(I(\mathcal{U};B_t)-\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\chi(\mathcal{U};Z_t^{\otimes n}))\ . \tag{47}$$

Combining (47) and (44) we obtain (26).

3) Lower bound for case without CSI

Fix a probability distribution p on A^n. Let

$$J_n=\lfloor 2^{\min_{t\in\theta}(nI(p;\mathsf{W}_t)-\log L_n)-n\mu}\rfloor\ ,$$

where L_n is a nature number that will be defined below. Let p', X^n, and D_j be defined as in classical case, then (24) still holds.

Define

$$Q_t(x^n):=\Pi_{p\mathtt{V}_t,\alpha\sqrt{a}}\Pi_{\mathtt{V}_t,\alpha}(x^n)\cdot\mathtt{V}_t^{\otimes n}(x^n)\cdot\Pi_{\mathtt{V}_t,\alpha}(x^n)\Pi_{p\mathtt{V}_t,\alpha\sqrt{a}}$$

and $\Theta_t:=\sum_{x^n\in\mathcal{T}^n_{p,\delta}}{p'}^n(x^n)Q_t(x^n)$.

Let $L_n=\lceil 2^{n\max_t(\chi(p;Z_t)+\delta)}\rceil$ and n be large enough, in the same way as our proof of (35) for the case with CSI at the encoder, there is a positive constant υ so that

$$Pr\left(\|\sum_{l=1}^{L_n}\frac{1}{L_n}Q_t(X_{j,l}^{(t)})-\Theta_t\|\leq\epsilon\ \forall t\ \forall j\right)\geq 1-2^{-n\upsilon}\ . \tag{48}$$

Choose a sufficiently α, by (24) and (48) there is a realization $x_{j,l}$ of $X_{j,l}$ with a positive probability such that: For all $t\in\theta$ and all $j\in\{1,\cdots J_n\}$, we have

$$\sum_{l=1}^{L_n}\frac{1}{L_n}\mathsf{W}_t^n(D_j^c|x_{j,l})\leq\epsilon\ ,$$

$$\|\sum_{l=1}^{L_n}\frac{1}{L_n}Q_t(x_{j,l})-\Theta_t\|\leq\epsilon\ .$$

For any $\gamma>0$ let

$$R:=\max_{\mathcal{U}\to A\to(BZ)_t}\left(\min_{t\in\theta}I(\mathcal{U};B_t)-\max_t\chi(\mathcal{U};Z_t)\right)-\gamma\ .$$

Then there is an (n,J_n) code $(E,\{D_j:j=1,\cdots,J_n\})$, where E is so build that $Pr\left(E(j)=x_{j,l}\right)=\frac{1}{L_{n,t}}$ for $l\in\{1,\cdots,L_{n,t}\}$, such that $\liminf_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log J_n\geq R$, and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\max_{t\in\theta}\max_{j\in\{1,\cdots,J_n\}}\sum_{l=1}^{L_n}\frac{1}{L_n}\mathsf{W}_t^n(D_j^c|x_{j,l}))=0\ . \tag{49}$$

In the same way as our proof of (43) for the case with CSI at the encoder,

$$\max_{t\in\theta}\chi(X_{uni};Z_t^{\otimes n})\leq\epsilon\ , \tag{50}$$

for any uniformly distributed distributed random variable X_{uni} with value in $\{1,\cdots,J_n\}$.

Combining (49) and (50) we obtain

$$C_S\geq\max_{\mathcal{U}\to A\to(BZ)_t}(\min_{t\in\theta}I(\mathcal{U};B_t)-\max_{t\in\theta}\chi(\mathcal{U};Z_t))\ .$$

■

V. COMPOUND CLASSICAL-QUANTUM WIRETAP CHANNEL

Let A, H, H', H'', θ, and $(W_t,V_t)_{t\in\theta}$ be defined as in Section II.

Theorem 2: The secrecy capacity of the compound classical-quantum wiretap channel in the case with CSI is given by

$$C_{CSI}=\lim_{n\to\infty}\min_{t\in\theta}\max_{P_{inp},w_t}\frac{1}{n}(\chi(P_{inp};B_t^{\otimes n})-\chi(P_{inp};Z_t^{\otimes n}))\ , \tag{51}$$

where B_t are the resulting random quantum states at the output of legal receiver channels and Z_t are the resulting random quantum states at the output of wiretap channels. The supremum is taken over all probability distributions P_{inp} on the input quantum states w_t.

Assume the sender's encoding is restricted to transmitting an indexed finite set of orthogonal quantum states $\{\rho_x:x\in A\}\subset\mathcal{S}(H'^{\otimes n})$, then the secrecy capacity of the compound classical-quantum wiretap channel in the case with no CSI at the encoder is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
&C_S \\
&=\lim_{n\to\infty}\max_{\mathcal{U}\to A\to(BZ)_t}\frac{1}{n}\Bigg(\min_{t\in\theta}\chi(\mathcal{U};B_t^{\otimes n}) \\
&-\max_{t\in\theta}\chi(\mathcal{U};Z_t^{\otimes n})\Bigg)\ .
\end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

Proof: At first, we are going to prove (51). Our idea is to send the information in two parts. Firstly, we send the channel state information with finite blocks of finite bits with a code C_1 to the receiver, and then, depending on t, we send the message with a code $C_2^{(t)}$ in the second part.

1.1) Sending channel state information with finite bits

For the first part we don't require that the first part should be secure against the wiretapper, since we assume that the wiretapper already has the full knowledge of the CSI.

By ignoring the security against the wiretapper, we can consider only the compound channel $(W_t)_{t\in\theta}$. Let $W=(W_t)_t$ be an arbitrary compound classical quantum channel. Then by [5] for each $\lambda\in(0,1)$ the λ-capacity $C(W,\lambda)$ equals

$$C(W,\lambda)=\max_{P_{inp}\in P(A)}\min_t\chi(P_{inp};W_t)\ . \tag{53}$$

If $\max_{P_{inp}}\min_t\chi(P_{inp};W_t)>0$ holds, then the sender can build a code C_1 such that the CSI can be sent to the legal receiver with a block with length $l\leq\frac{\log T}{\min_t\max_{P_{inp}}\chi(P_{inp},W_t)}-\epsilon$. If $\max_{P_{inp}}\min_t\chi(P_{inp};W_t)=0$ holds, we can not build a code C_1 such that the CSI can be sent to the legal receiver. But this does not cause any problem for our proof, since if

$\max_{P_{inp}} \min_t \chi(P_{inp}; W_t) = 0$ the right hand side of (51) is zero. This means in this case we need to do nothing.

1.2) Message transformation when both the sender and the legal receiver know CSI

If both the sender and the legal receiver have the full knowledge of t, then we only have to look at the single wiretap channel (W_t, V_t).

In [12] and [13] it was shown that if n is sufficiently large, there exists an (n, J_n) code for the quantum wiretap channel (W, V) with

$$\log J_n = \max_{P_{inp},w} (\chi(P_{inp}; B^{\otimes n}) - \chi(P_{inp}; Z^{\otimes n})) - \epsilon \ , \quad (54)$$

for any positive ϵ and positive δ, where B is the resulting random variable at the output of legal receiver's channel and Z the output of the wiretap channel.

When the sender and the legal receiver both know t, they can build an $(n, J_{n,t})$ code $C_2^{(t)}$ where

$$\log J_{n,t} = \max_{P_{inp},w_t} (\chi(P_{inp}; B_t^{\otimes n}) - \chi(P_{inp}; Z_t^{\otimes n})) - \epsilon \ . \quad (55)$$

Thus,

$$C_{CSI} \geq \lim_{n\to\infty} \min_{t\in\theta} \max_{P_{inp},w_t} \frac{1}{n}(\chi(P_{inp}; B_t^{\otimes n}) - \chi(P_{inp}; Z_t^{\otimes n})) \ . \quad (56)$$

Remark 4: For the construction of the second part of our code, we use random coding and request that the randomization can be sent (cf. [12]). However, it was shown in [8] that the randomization could not always be sent if we require that we use one unique code which is secure against the wiretapper and suitable for every channel state, i.e., it does not depend on t. This is not a counterexample to our results above, neither to the construction of C_1 nor to the construction of $C_2^{(t)}$, because of the following facts.

The first part of our code does not need to be secure. For our second part, the legal transmitters can use the following strategy: At first they build a code $C_1 = (E, \{D_t : t = 1, \cdots, |\theta|\})$ and a code $C_2^{(t)} = (E^{(t)}, \{D_j^{(t)} : j = 1, \cdots, J_n\})$ for every $t \in \theta$. If the sender wants to send the CSI $t' \in \theta$ and the message j, he encodes t' with E and j with $E^{(t')}$, then he sends both parts together through the channel. After receiving both parts, the legal receiver decodes the first part with $\{D_t : t\}$, and chooses the right decoders $\{D_j^{(t')} : j\} \in \left\{\{D_j^{(t)} : j\} : t \in \theta\right\}$ to decode the second part. With this strategy, we can avoid using one unique code which is suitable for every channel state.

1.3) Upper bound for the case CSI at the encoder

For any $\epsilon > 0$ choose $t' \in \theta$ such that $C(W_{t'}, V_{t'}) \leq \inf_{t\in\theta} C(W_t, V_t) + \epsilon$.

From [12] and [13] we know that the secrecy capacity of the quantum wiretap channel $(W_{t'}, V_{t'})$ cannot be greater than

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \max_{P_{inp},w_{t'}} \frac{1}{n}(\chi(P_{inp}; B_{t'}^{\otimes n}) - \chi(P_{inp}; Z_{t'}^{\otimes n})) \ .$$

Since we cannot exceed the capacity of the worst wiretap channel, we have

$$C_{CSI} \leq \lim_{n\to\infty} \min_{t\in\theta} \max_{P_{inp},w_t} \frac{1}{n}(\chi(P_{inp}; B_t^{\otimes n}) - \chi(P_{inp}; Z_t^{\otimes n})). \quad (57)$$

This together with (56) completes the proof of (51).

Remark 5: In [26] it was shown that if for a given t and any $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\chi(P_{inp}; B_t^{\otimes n}) \geq \chi(P_{inp}; Z_t^{\otimes n})$$

holds for all $P_{inp} \in P(A)$ and $\{w_t(j) : j = 1, \cdots, J_n\} \subset S(H^{\otimes n})$, then

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \max_{P_{inp},w_t} \frac{1}{n}(\chi(P_{inp}; B_t^{\otimes n}) - \chi(P_{inp}; Z_t^{\otimes n}))$$
$$= \max_{P_{inp},w_t} (\chi(P_{inp}; B_t) - \chi(P_{inp}; Z_t)) \ .$$

Thus if for every $t \in \theta$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$I(P_{inp}, B_t^{\otimes n}) \geq I(P_{inp}; Z_t^{\otimes n})$$

holds for all $P_{inp} \in P(A)$ and $\{w_t(j) : j = 1, \cdots, J_n\} \subset S(H^{\otimes n})$, we have

$$C_{CSI} = \min_{t\in\theta} \max_{P_{inp},w_t} (\chi(P_{inp}; B_t) - \chi(P_{inp}; Z_t)) \ .$$

Now we are going to prove (52).

2.1) Lower bound for case without CSI

Fix a probability distribution p on A^n. Let

$$J_n = \lfloor 2^{\min_{t\in\theta} \chi(p;B_t^{\otimes n}) - \max_{t\in\theta} \chi(p;Z_t^{\otimes n}) - 2n\mu} \rfloor \ ,$$
$$L_n = \lceil 2^{\max_t \chi(p;Z_t^{\otimes n}) + n\mu} \rceil \ ,$$

and let p' and $X^n = \{X_{j,l} : j, l\}$ be defined as in the classical case (cf. Section III). Since $J_n \cdot L_n \leq 2^{\min_t \chi(p;B_t^{\otimes n}) - n\mu}$, in [11], it was shown that if n is sufficiently large, there exist a collection of quantum states $\{\rho_{x^n} : x^n \in A^n\} \subset \mathcal{S}(H'^{\otimes n})$, a collection of positive semi-definite operators $\{D_{t,x^n} : t \in \theta, x^n \in A^n\}$, and a positive constant β, such that for any $(t, j, l) \in \theta \times \{1, \cdots, J_n\} \times \{1, \cdots, L_n\}$ it holds

$$Pr\left[\mathrm{tr}\left(W_t^n(\rho_{X_{j,l}}^{\otimes n}) D_{t,X_{j,l}}\right) \geq 1 - 2^{-n\beta}\right] > 1 - 2^{-n\beta} \ , \quad (58)$$

and for any realization $\{x_{j,l} : j, l\}$ of $\{X_{j,l} : j, l\}$ it holds that

$$\sum_{t\in\theta} \sum_{j=1}^{J_n} \sum_{l=1}^{L_n} D_{t,x_{j,l}} \leq id \ .$$

Define

$$Q_t(\rho_{x^n}) := \Pi_{pV_t,\alpha\sqrt{a}} \Pi_{V_t,\alpha}(x^n) \cdot V_t^{\otimes n}(\rho_{x^n}) \cdot \Pi_{V_t,\alpha}(x^n) \Pi_{pV_t,\alpha\sqrt{a}} \ ,$$

and $\Theta_t := \sum_{x^n\in\mathcal{T}^n_{p,\delta}} p'^n(x^n) Q_t(\rho_{x^n})$.

Choosing n sufficiently large, in the same way as our proof of (35) for the classical compound channel with quantum wiretapper, there is a positive constant υ such that

$$Pr\left(\|\sum_{l=1}^{L_n} \frac{1}{L_n} Q_t(\rho_{X_{j,l}^{(t)}}) - \Theta_t\| \leq \epsilon \ \forall t \ \forall j\right) \geq 1 - 2^{-n\upsilon} \ . \quad (59)$$

Choosing a sufficiently α. If n is sufficiently large, we can find a realization $x_{j,l}$ of $X_{j,l}$ with a positive probability such that: For all $j \in \{1, \cdots J_n\}$, we have

$$\min_{t\in\theta} \operatorname{tr}\left(W_t^n(\rho_{x_{j,l}}^{\otimes n})D_{t,x_{j,l}}\right) \geq 1-2^{-n\beta}$$

and

$$\max_{t\in\theta}\|\sum_{l=1}^{L_n}\frac{1}{L_n}Q_t(\rho_{x_{j,l}})-\Theta_t\| \leq \epsilon \ .$$

Define $D_j := \sum_{t\in\theta}\sum_{l=1}^{L_n} D_{t,x_{j,l}}$, then $\sum_{j=1}^{J_n} D_j = \sum_{t\in\theta}\sum_{j=1}^{J_n}\sum_{l=1}^{L_n} D_{t,x_{j,l}} \leq id$. Furthermore, for all $t' \in \theta$ and $l' \in \{1, \cdots, L_n\}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\operatorname{tr}\left(W_{t'}^n(\rho_{x_{j,l'}}^{\otimes n})D_j\right)\\
&= \sum_{t\in\theta}\sum_{l=1}^{L_n}\operatorname{tr}\left(W_{t'}^n(\rho_{x_{j,l'}}^{\otimes n})D_{t,x_{j,l}}\right)\\
&\geq \operatorname{tr}\left(W_{t'}^n(\rho_{x_{j,l'}}^{\otimes n})D_{t',x_{j,l'}}\right)\\
&\geq 1-2^{-n\beta} \ ,
\end{aligned}$$

the inequality in the third line holds because for two positive semi-definite matrices M_1 and M_2, we always have $\operatorname{tr}(M_1M_2) = \operatorname{tr}\left(\sqrt{M_1}M_2\sqrt{M_1}\right) \geq 0$.

For any $\gamma > 0$ let

$$R := \max_{\mathcal{U}\to A\to(BZ)_t}\frac{1}{n}\left[\min_{t\in\theta}\chi(p;B_t^{\otimes n}) - \max_{t\in\theta}\chi(p;Z_t^{\otimes n})\right] - \gamma \ .$$

Then for any positive λ, there is an (n, J_n, λ) code $\Bigg(\{w(j) := \sum_{l=1}^{L_n}\frac{1}{L_n}\rho_{x_{j,l}}^{\otimes n} : j = 1, \cdots, J_n,\}, \{D_j : j = 1, \cdots, J_n\}\Bigg)$, such that $\liminf_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log J_n \geq R$,

$$\max_{t\in\theta}\max_{j\in\{1,\cdots,J_n\}}\operatorname{tr}\left(id_{H''^{\otimes n}} - W_t^{\otimes n}\left(w(j)\right)D_j\right) \leq \lambda \ , \quad (60)$$

and in the same way as our proof of (43) for the classical compound channel with quantum wiretapper,

$$\max_{t\in\theta}\chi(X_{uni};Z_t^{\otimes n}) \leq \lambda \ , \quad (61)$$

for any uniformly distributed random variable X_{uni} with value in $\{1, \cdots, J_n\}$.

Combining (60) and (61) we obtain

$$C_S \geq \lim_{n\to\infty}\max_{\mathcal{U}\to A\to(BZ)_t}\frac{1}{n}\left(\min_{t\in\theta}\chi(\mathcal{U};B_t^{\otimes n}) - \max_{t\in\theta}\chi(\mathcal{U};Z_t^{\otimes n})\right) \quad (62)$$

2.2) Upper bound for case without CSI

Let $(\mathcal{C}_n) = (\{\rho_j^{(n)} : j\}, \{D_j^{(n)} : j\})$ be a sequence of (n, J_n, λ_n) code such that

$$\max_{t\in\theta}\max_{j\in\{1,\cdots,J_n\}}\operatorname{tr}\left(id - W_t^{\otimes n}\left(\rho_j^{(n)}\right)D_j^{(n)}\right) \leq \lambda_n \ , \quad (63)$$

$$\max_{t\in\theta}\chi(X_{uni};Z_t^{\otimes n}) =: \epsilon_{2,n} \ , \quad (64)$$

where $\lim_{n\to\infty}\lambda_n = 0$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty}\epsilon_{2,n} = 0$, X_{uni} denotes the random variable which is uniformly distributed on the message set $\{1, \ldots, J_n\}$.

Denote the classical capacity of the quantum channel W_t in the sense of [27] by $C(W_t)$. Choose $t' \in \theta$ such that $C(W_{t'}) = \min_{t\in\theta} C(W_t)$.

It is known (cf. [20]) that $C(W_{t'})$ cannot exceed $\chi(X_{uni};B_{t'}^{\otimes n}) + \xi$ for any constant $\xi > 0$. Since the secrecy capacity of a compound wiretap channel cannot exceed the capacity of the worst channel without wiretapper, for any $\epsilon > 0$ choose $\xi = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon$, if n is large enough the secrecy rate of $(\mathcal{C}_n)$ cannot be greater than

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{n}\chi(X_{uni};B_{t'}^{\otimes n}) + \xi\\
&= \min_{t\in\theta}\frac{1}{n}\chi(X_{uni};B_t^{\otimes n}) + \xi\\
&\leq \min_{t\in\theta}\frac{1}{n}\chi(X_{uni};B_t^{\otimes n}) - \max_{t\in\theta}\frac{1}{n}\chi(X_{uni};Z_t^{\otimes n}) + \xi + \frac{1}{n}\epsilon_{2,n}\\
&\leq \frac{1}{n}\left(\min_{t\in\theta}\chi(X_{uni};B_t^{\otimes n}) - \max_{t\in\theta}\chi(X_{uni};Z_t^{\otimes n})\right) + \epsilon \ .
\end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

Thus

$$C_S \leq \lim_{n\to\infty}\max_{\mathcal{U}\to A\to(BZ)_t}\frac{1}{n}\left(\min_{t\in\theta}\chi(\mathcal{U};B_t^{\otimes n}) - \max_{t\in\theta}\chi(\mathcal{U};Z_t^{\otimes n})\right) \ . \quad (66)$$

Combining (66) and (62) we obtain (52). ■

So far, we assumed that $|\theta|$, the number of the channels, is finite, therefore we can send the CSI with finite bits to the receiver in the case having CSI at the encoder. Now we look at the case where $|\theta|$ can be arbitrary. We of course are not allowed to send the CSI with finite bits if $|\theta| = \infty$, but in this case, we may use a “finite approximation” to obtain

Corollary 1: For an arbitrary set θ we have

$$C_{S,CSI} = \lim_{n\to\infty}\inf_{t\in\theta}\max_{P_{inp},w_t}\frac{1}{n}(\chi(P_{inp};B_t^{\otimes n}) - \chi(P_{inp};Z_t^{\otimes n})) \ . \quad (67)$$

Proof: Let $W : \mathcal{S}(H') \to \mathcal{S}(H'')$ be a linear map, then let

$$\|W\|_\diamond := \sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\max_{a\in S(\mathbb{C}^n\otimes H'), \|a\|_1=1}\|(id_n \otimes W)(a)\|_1 \quad (68)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_1$ stands for the trace norm.

It is known [21] that this norm is multiplicative, i.e. $\|W \otimes W'\|_\diamond = \|W\|_\diamond \cdot \|W'\|_\diamond$.

.A τ-net in the space of the completely positive trace preserving maps $\mathcal{S}(H') \to \mathcal{S}(H'')$ is a finite set $\left(W^{(k)}\right)_{k=1}^K$ of completely positive trace preserving maps $\mathcal{S}(H') \to \mathcal{S}(H'')$ with the property that for each completely positive trace preserving map $W : \mathcal{S}(H') \to \mathcal{S}(H'')$, there is at least one $k \in \{1, \cdots, K\}$ with $\|W - W^{(k)}\|_\diamond < \tau$.

Lemma 4 ($\tau-$net [19]): Let H' and H'' be finite-dimensional complex Hilbert spaces. For any $\tau \in (0, 1]$ there is a τ-net of quantum-channels $\left(W^{(k)}\right)_{k=1}^K$ in the space of the completely positive trace preserving maps $\mathcal{S}(H') \to \mathcal{S}(H'')$ with $K \leq (\frac{3}{\tau})^{2d'^4}$, where $d' = \dim H'$.

If $|\theta|$ is arbitrary, then for any $\xi > 0$ let $\tau = \frac{\xi}{-\log\xi}$. By Lemma 4 there exists a finite set θ' with $|\theta'| \leq (\frac{3}{\tau})^{2d'^4}$ and τ-nets $(W_{t'})_{t'\in\theta'}$, $(V_{t'})_{t'\in\theta'}$ such that for every $t \in \theta$ we can find a $t' \in \theta'$ with $\|W_t - W_{t'}\|_\lozenge \leq \tau$ and $\|V_t - V_{t'}\|_\lozenge \leq \tau$. For every $t' \in \theta'$ the legal transmitters build a code $C_2^{(t')} = \{w_{t'}, \{D_{t',j} : j\}\}$. Since by [12], the error probability of the code $C_2^{(t')}$ decreases exponentially to its length, there is an $N = O(-\log\xi)$ such that for all $t'' \in \theta'$ it holds

$$\frac{1}{J_N}\sum_{j=1}^{J_N} \mathrm{tr}\left(W_{t''}^{\otimes N}\left(w_{t''}(j)\right) D_{t'',j}\right) \geq 1 - \lambda - \xi \ , \tag{69}$$

$$\chi(X_{uni}; Z_{t'}^{\otimes N}) \leq \xi \ , \tag{70}$$

Then, if the sender obtains the channel state information "t" , he chooses a "t'" $\in \theta'$ such that $\|W_t - W_{t'}\|_\lozenge \leq \tau$ and $\|V_t - V_{t'}\|_\lozenge \leq \tau$. He can send "$t'$" to the legal receiver in the first part with finite bits, and then they build a code $C_2^{(t')}$ that fulfills (69) and (70) to transmit the message.

For every t' and j let $|\psi_{t'}(j)\rangle\langle\psi_{t'}(j)| \in \mathcal{S}(H'^{\otimes N} \otimes H'^{\otimes N})$ be an arbitrary purification of the quantum state $w_{t'}(j)$, then $\mathrm{tr}\left[\left(W_t^{\otimes N} - W_{t'}^{\otimes N}\right)(w_{t'}(j))\right] = \mathrm{tr}\left(\mathrm{tr}_{H'^{\otimes N}}\left[id_{H'}^{\otimes N} \otimes (W_t^{\otimes N} - W_{t'}^{\otimes N})\left(|\psi_{t'}(j)\rangle\langle\psi_{t'}(j)|\right)\right]\right)$ We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{tr}\left[\left(W_t^{\otimes N} - W_{t'}^{\otimes N}\right)(w_{t'}(j))\right]\\
&= \mathrm{tr}\left(\mathrm{tr}_{H'^{\otimes N}}\left[id_{H'}^{\otimes N} \otimes (W_t^{\otimes N} - W_{t'}^{\otimes N})\left(|\psi_{t'}(j)\rangle\langle\psi_{t'}(j)|\right)\right]\right)\\
&= \mathrm{tr}\left[id_{H'}^{\otimes N} \otimes (W_t^{\otimes n} - W_{t'}^{\otimes N})\left(|\psi_{t'}(j)\rangle\langle\psi_{t'}(j)|\right)\right]\\
&\leq d'd''N^2 \left\|id_{H'}^{\otimes N} \otimes (W_t^{\otimes N} - W_{t'}^{\otimes N})\left(|\psi_{t'}(j)\rangle\langle\psi_{t'}(j)|\right)\right\|_1\\
&\leq d'd''N^2 \|W_t^{\otimes N} - W_{t'}^{\otimes N}\|_\lozenge \cdot \|(|\psi_{t'}(j)\rangle\langle\psi_{t'}(j)|)\|_1\\
&\leq d'd''N^3\tau \ ,
\end{aligned}$$

where $d'' = \dim H''$. The second equality follows from the definition of trace. The first inequality follows from the fact that for any matrix $(a_{i,j})_{i=1,\cdots,n,j=1,\cdots,n}$ it holds, $n \cdot \|(a_{i,j})_{i,j}\|_1 = n \cdot \max_{1\leq j\leq n}\sum_{i=1}^n |a_{ij}| \geq \sum_j\sum_i |a_{ij}| \geq \sum_j |a_{jj}| \geq |\sum_j a_{jj}| = |\mathrm{tr}(a_{i,j})_{i,j}|$. The second inequality follows by the definition of $\|\cdot\|_\lozenge$. The third inequality follows from the facts that $\|\left(|\psi_{t'}(j)\rangle\langle\psi_{t'}(j)|\right)\|_1 = 1$ and $\left\|W_t^{\otimes N} - W_{t'}^{\otimes N}\right\|_\lozenge = \left\|(W_t - W_{t'})^{\otimes N}\right\|_\lozenge = N \cdot \|W_t - W_{t'}\|_\lozenge$, since $\|\cdot\|_\lozenge$ is multiplicative.

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\frac{1}{J_N}\sum_{j=1}^{J_N}\mathrm{tr}\left(W_t^{\otimes N}\left(w_{t'}(j)\right)D_{t',j}\right)\right.\\
&\left.\quad - \frac{1}{J_N}\sum_{j=1}^{J_N}\mathrm{tr}\left(W_{t'}^{\otimes N}\left(w_{t'}(j)\right)D_{t',j}\right)\right|\\
&\leq \frac{1}{J_N}\sum_{j=1}^{J_N}\left|\mathrm{tr}\left[\left(W_t^{\otimes N} - W_{t'}^{\otimes N}\right)(w_{t'}(j))D_{t',j}\right]\right|\\
&\leq \frac{1}{J_N}\sum_{j=1}^{J_N}\left|\mathrm{tr}\left[\left(W_t^{\otimes N} - W_{t'}^{\otimes N}\right)(w_{t'}(j))\right]\right|\\
&\leq \frac{1}{J_N}J_N d'd''N^3\tau\\
&= d'd''N^3\tau \ .
\end{aligned} \tag{71}$$

$d'd''N^3\tau$ can be arbitrarily small when ξ is close to zero, since $N = O(-\log\xi)$.

Let X_{uni} be a random variable uniformly distributed on $\{1,\cdots,J_N\}$, and $\{\rho(j) : j = 1,\cdots,J_n\}$ be a set of quantum states labeled by elements of $\{1,\cdots,J_n\}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\chi(X_{uni}; V_t) - \chi(X_{uni}; V_{t'})|\\
&\leq \left|S\left(\sum_{j=1}^{J_N}\frac{1}{J_N}V_t(\rho(j))\right) - S\left(\sum_{j=1}^{J_N}\frac{1}{J_N}V_{t'}(\rho(j))\right)\right|\\
&+ \left|\sum_{j=1}^{J_N}\frac{1}{J_N}S\left(V_t(\rho(j))\right) - \sum_{j=1}^{J_N}\frac{1}{J_N}S\left(V_{t'}(\rho(j))\right)\right|\\
&\leq 2\tau\log d - 2\tau\log\tau \ ,
\end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

where $d = \dim H$. The inequality in the last line holds by Lemma 3 and because $\|V_t(\rho) - V_{t'}(\rho)\| \leq \tau$ for all $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(H)$ when $\|V_t - V_{t'}\|_\lozenge \leq \tau$.

By (71) and (72) we have

$$\sup_{t\in\theta}\frac{1}{J_N}\sum_{j=1}^{J_N}\mathrm{tr}\left(W_t^{\otimes N}\left(w_{t'}(j)\right)D_{t',j}\right) \geq 1-\lambda-\xi-d'd''N^3\tau \ ,$$

$$\chi(X_{uni}; Z_t^{\otimes N}) \leq \xi + 2\tau\log d - 2\tau\log\tau \ .$$

Since $\xi + d'd''N^3\tau$ and $2\tau\log d$ can be arbitrarily small, when ξ is close to zero, we have

$$\sup_{t\in\theta}\frac{1}{J_N}\sum_{j=1}^{J_N}\mathrm{tr}\left(W_t^{\otimes N}\left(w_{t'}(j)\right)D_{t',j}\right) \geq 1 - \lambda \ ,$$

$$\sup_{t\in\theta}\chi(X_{uni}; Z_t^{\otimes N}) \leq \epsilon \ .$$

The bits that the sender uses to transform the CSI is large but constant, so it is still negligible compared to the second part. We obtain

$$C_{CSI} \geq \lim_{n\to\infty}\inf_{t\in\theta}\max_{P_{inp},w_t}\frac{1}{n}(\chi(P_{inp}; B_t^{\otimes n}) - \chi(P_{inp}; Z_t^{\otimes n})) \ . \tag{73}$$

The proof of the converse is similar to those given in the proof of Theorem 2, where we consider a worst t'. ■

Remark 6: In (51) and Corollary 1 we have only required that legal receiver can decode the correct message with a high probability if n is sufficiently large. We have not specified how fast the error probability tends to zero when the code length goes to infinity. If we analyze the relation between the error probability ε and the code length, then we have the following facts.

In the case of finite θ, let ε_1 denote the error probability of the first part of the code (i.e. the legal receiver does not decode the correct CSI), and let ε_2 denote the error probability of the second part of the code (i.e. the legal receiver decodes the correct CSI, but does not decode the message). Since the length of first part of the code is $l \cdot \log c \cdot c' = O(\log\varepsilon_1)$, we have ε_1^{-1} is $O(\exp(l \cdot \log c \cdot c')) = O(\exp(n))$, where n stands for the length of the first part of the code. And for the second part of the code, ε_2 decreased exponentially to the length of the second part, as proven in [12]. Thus, the error probability $\varepsilon = \max\{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2\}$ decreases exponentially to the code length in the case of finite θ.

If θ is infinite, let ε_1 denote the error probability of the first part of the code probability. Here we have to build two τ-nets for a suitable τ, each contains $O((\frac{-\log \varepsilon_1}{\varepsilon_1})^{-2d'^4})$ channels. If we want to send the CSI of these τ-nets, the length of first part l will be $O(-2d'^4 \cdot \log(\varepsilon_1 \log \varepsilon_1))$, which means here ε_1^{-1} will be $O(\exp(\frac{n}{4d'^4})) = O(\exp(n))$. Thus we can still achieve that the error probability decreases exponentially to the code length in case of infinite θ.

VI. ENTANGLEMENT GENERATION OVER COMPOUND QUANTUM CHANNELS

Let $\mathfrak{P}$, $\mathfrak{Q}$, $H^{\mathfrak{P}}$, $H^{\mathfrak{Q}}$, θ, and $\left(N_t^{\otimes n}\right)_{t\in\theta}$ be defined as in section II (i.e. we assume θ to be finite).

Denote $\dim H^{\mathfrak{P}}$ by a, denote $\mathcal{X} := \{1, \cdots, a\}$. Consider the eigen-decomposition of $\rho^{\mathfrak{P}}$ into the orthonormal pure quantum state ensemble $\{p(x), |\phi_x\rangle^{\mathfrak{P}} : x \in \mathcal{X}\}$,

$$\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} p(x)|\phi_x\rangle\langle\phi_x|^{\mathfrak{P}} = \rho^{\mathfrak{P}} \ .$$

The distribution p defines a random variable X.

Theorem 3: The entanglement generating capacity of $(N_t)_{t\in\theta}$ is bounded as follows

$$A \geq \max_p \left(\min_{t\in\theta} \chi(p; Q_t) - \max_{t\in\theta} \chi(p; E_t) \right) \ , \qquad (74)$$

where Q_t stands for the quantum outputs that the receiver observes at channel state t, and E_t the quantum outputs at the environment.

(Theorem 3 is weaker than the result in [7], the reason is that we use for our proof a different quantum channel representation. For details and the result in [7] cf. Section VII)

Proof: Let $\rho^{\mathfrak{P}} \to U_{N_t}\rho^{\mathfrak{P}}U_{N_t}^*$ be an unitary transformation which represents N_t (cf. Section VII), where U_{N_t} is a linear operator $\mathcal{S}(H^{\mathfrak{P}}) \to \mathcal{S}(H^{\mathfrak{Q}\mathfrak{E}})$, and $\mathfrak{E}$ is the quantum system of the environment. Fix a $\rho^{\mathfrak{P}}$ with eigen-decomposition $\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} p(x)|\phi_x\rangle^{\mathfrak{P}}\langle\phi_x|^{\mathfrak{P}}$. If the channel state is t, the local output density matrix seen by the receiver is

$$\mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{E}} \left(\sum_x p(x) U_{N_t}|\phi_x\rangle\langle\phi_x|^{\mathfrak{P}} U_{N_t}^* \right) \ ,$$

and the local output density matrix seen by the environment (which we interpret as the wiretapper) is

$$\mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{Q}} \left(\sum_x p(x) U_{N_t}|\phi_x\rangle\langle\phi_x|^{\mathfrak{P}} U_{N_t}^* \right) \ .$$

Therefore $(N_t)_{t\in\theta}$ define a compound classical-quantum wiretap channel $(W_{N_t}, V_{N_t})_{t\in\theta}$, where $W_{N_t} : H^{\mathfrak{P}} \to H^{\mathfrak{Q}}$, $\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} p(x)|\phi_x\rangle\langle\phi_x|^{\mathfrak{P}} \to \mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{E}}\left(\sum_x p(x)U_{N_t}|\phi_x\rangle\langle\phi_x|^{\mathfrak{P}}U_{N_t}^*\right)$, and $V_{N_t} : H^{\mathfrak{P}} \to H^{\mathfrak{Q}}$, $\sum_{x\in\mathcal{X}} p(x)|\phi_x\rangle\langle\phi_x|^{\mathfrak{P}} \to \mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{E}}\left(\sum_x p(x)U_{N_t}|\phi_x\rangle\langle\phi_x|^{\mathfrak{P}}U_{N_t}^*\right)$.

1) Building the encoder and the first part of the decoding operator

Let

$$J_n = \lceil 2^{n[\min_t \chi(X;Q_t) - \max_t \chi(X;E_t) - 2\delta]} \rceil \ ,$$

and

$$L_n = \lceil 2^{n(\max_t \chi(X;E_t) + \delta)} \rceil \ .$$

For the compound classical-quantum wiretap channel $(W_{N_t}, V_{N_t})_{t\in\theta}$, since

$$\begin{aligned}&\#\{(j,l) : j = 1, \cdots, J_n, l = 1, \cdots, L_n\}\\ &= J_n \cdot L_n \leq 2^{n \min_t [\chi(X;Q_t) - \delta]} \ ,\end{aligned}$$

if n is large enough, by Theorem 2 and [11], the following holds. There is a collection of quantum states $\{\rho_{x_{j,l}}^{\mathfrak{P}^n} : j = 1, \cdots, J_n, l = 1, \cdots, L_n\} \subset \mathcal{S}(H^{\mathfrak{P}^n})$, a collection of positive semi-definite operators $\{D_{t,j,l} := D_{t,x_{j,l}} : t \in \theta, j = 1, \cdots, J_n, l = 1, \cdots, L_n\}$, a positive constant β, and a quantum state $\xi_t^{\mathfrak{E}^n}$ on $H^{\mathfrak{E}^n}$, such that

$$\mathrm{tr}\left((D_{t,x_{j,l}}^{\mathfrak{Q}^n} \otimes id^{\mathfrak{E}^n}) U_{N_t} \rho_{x_{j,l}}^{\mathfrak{P}^n} U_{N_t}^* \right) \geq 1 - 2^{-n\beta} \ , \qquad (75)$$

and

$$\|\omega_{j,t}^{\mathfrak{E}^n} - \xi_t^{\mathfrak{E}^n}\|_1 < \epsilon \ , \qquad (76)$$

where $\omega_{j,t}^{\mathfrak{E}^n} := \frac{1}{L_{n,t}} \sum_{l=1}^{L_{n,t}} \mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{Q}^n} \left(U_{N_t} \rho_{x_{j,l}}^{\mathfrak{P}^n} U_{N_t}^* \right)$.

Now the quantum state $\rho_{x_{j,l}}^{\mathfrak{P}^n}$ may be pure or mixed. Assume $\rho_{x_{j,l}}^{\mathfrak{P}^n}$ is a mixed quantum state $\sum_{i=1}^n p'_{j,l}(i)|\varkappa_{x_{j,l}}^{(i)}\rangle\langle\varkappa_{x_{j,l}}^{(i)}|^{\mathfrak{P}^n}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{i=1}^n p'_{j,l}(i)\mathrm{tr}\left((D_{t,x_{j,l}}^{\mathfrak{Q}^n} \otimes id^{\mathfrak{E}^n}) U_{N_t} |\varkappa_{x_{j,l}}^{(i)}\rangle\langle\varkappa_{x_{j,l}}^{(i)}|^{\mathfrak{P}^n} U_{N_t}^* \right)\\ &\mathrm{tr}\left((D_{t,x_{j,l}}^{\mathfrak{Q}^n} \otimes id^{\mathfrak{E}^n}) U_{N_t} (\sum_{i=1}^n p'_{j,l}(i)|\varkappa_{x_{j,l}}^{(i)}\rangle\langle\varkappa_{x_{j,l}}^{(i)}|^{\mathfrak{P}^n}) U_{N_t}^* \right)\\ &\geq 1 - 2^{-n\beta} \ .\end{aligned}$$

Thus, for all i such that $p'_{j,l}(i) \geq \frac{2^{-n\beta}}{1-2^{-n\beta}}$ it must hold

$$\mathrm{tr}\left((D_{t,x_{j,l}}^{\mathfrak{Q}^n} \otimes id^{\mathfrak{E}^n}) U_{N_t} |\varkappa_{x_{j,l}}^{(i)}\rangle\langle\varkappa_{x_{j,l}}^{(i)}|^{\mathfrak{P}^n} U_{N_t}^* \right) \geq 1 - 2^{-n\beta} \ .$$

If n is large enough, then there is at least one $i_{l,j} \in \{1, \cdots, n\}$ such that $p'_{j,l}(i_{l,j}) \geq \frac{2^{-n\beta}}{1-2^{-n\beta}}$. By Theorem 2, there is a $\xi_t^{\mathfrak{E}^n}$ on $H^{\mathfrak{E}^n}$, such that

$$\|\frac{1}{L_{n,t}} \sum_{l=1}^{L_{n,t}} \mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{Q}^n} \left(U_{N_t} |\varkappa_{x_{j,l}}^{(i_{l,j})}\rangle\langle\varkappa_{x_{j,l}}^{(i_{l,j})}|^{\mathfrak{P}^n} U_{N_t}^* \right) - \xi_t^{\mathfrak{E}^n}\|_1 < \epsilon \ .$$

Thus,

$$\left(\{|\varkappa_{x_{j,l}}^{(i_{l,j})}\rangle\langle\varkappa_{x_{j,l}}^{(i_{l,j})}|^{\mathfrak{P}^n} : j, l\}, \{D_{t,x_{j,l}}^{\mathfrak{Q}^n} : j, l, t\} \right)$$

is a code with the same security rate as

$$\left(\{\rho_{x_{j,l}}^{\mathfrak{P}^n} : j, l\}, \{D_{t,x_{j,l}}^{\mathfrak{Q}^n} : j, l, t\} \right) \ .$$

Hence we may assume that $\rho_{x_{j,l}}^{\mathfrak{P}^n}$ is a pure quantum state.

Assume $\rho_{x_{j,l}}^{\mathfrak{P}^n} = |\varkappa_{j,l}\rangle\langle\varkappa_{j,l}|^{\mathfrak{P}^n}$. Let $H^{\mathfrak{M}}$ be a J_n-dimensional Hilbert space with an orthonormal basis $\{|j\rangle^{\mathfrak{M}} :$

$j = 1, \cdots, J_n\}$, $H^{\mathfrak{L}}$ be a L_n-dimensional Hilbert space with an orthonormal basis $\{|l\rangle^{\mathfrak{L}} : l = 1, \cdots, L_{n,t}\}$, and H^{θ} be a $|\theta|$-dimensional Hilbert Space with an orthonormal basis $\{|t\rangle^{\theta} : t \in \theta\}$. Let $|0\rangle^{\mathfrak{M}}|0\rangle^{\mathfrak{L}}|0\rangle^{\theta}$ be the ancillas on $H^{\mathfrak{M}}$, $H^{\mathfrak{L}}$, and H^{θ}, respectively, that the receiver adds. We can (cf. [20]) define a unitary matrix $V^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta}$ on $H^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta}$ such that for any given quantum state $\rho^{\mathfrak{Q}^n} \in \mathcal{S}(H^{\mathfrak{Q}^n})$ we have

$$V^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta}\left(\rho^{\mathfrak{Q}^n} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|^{\mathfrak{M}} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|^{\mathfrak{L}} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|^{\theta}\right)(V^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta})^*$$
$$= \sum_t \sum_j \sum_l \left(D^{\mathfrak{Q}^n}_{t,x_{j,l}}\rho^{\mathfrak{Q}^n}\right) \otimes |j\rangle\langle j|^{\mathfrak{M}}|l\rangle\langle l|^{\mathfrak{L}}|t\rangle\langle t|^{\theta} \ .$$

Denote

$$\psi^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta}_{j,l,t}$$
$$:= \left(id^{\mathfrak{E}^n} \otimes V^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta}\right)\left(U_N \otimes id^{\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta}\right)\Big[|\varkappa_{j,l}\rangle\langle\varkappa_{j,l}|^{\mathfrak{P}^n}$$
$$\otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|^{\mathfrak{M}} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|^{\mathfrak{L}} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|^{\theta}\Big]\left(U_N \otimes id^{\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta}\right)^*$$
$$\left(id^{\mathfrak{E}^n} \otimes V^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta}\right)^* \ ,$$

in view of (75), we have

$$F\left(\mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n}\left(\psi^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta}_{j,l,t}\right), |j\rangle\langle j|^{\mathfrak{M}} \otimes |l\rangle\langle l|^{\mathfrak{L}} \otimes |t\rangle\langle t|^{\theta}\right)$$
$$\geq 1 - \epsilon \ . \tag{77}$$

By Uhlmann's theorem (cf. e.g. [27]) we can find a $|\zeta_{j,l,t}\rangle^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n}$ on $H^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n}$, such that

$$\langle 0|^{\theta}\langle 0|^{\mathfrak{L}}\langle 0|^{\mathfrak{M}}\langle\varkappa_{j,l}|^{\mathfrak{P}^n}\left(U_{N_t} \otimes id^{\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta}\right)^*$$
$$\left(id^{\mathfrak{E}^n} \otimes V^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta}\right)^*|\zeta_{j,l,t}\rangle^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n}|j\rangle^{\mathfrak{M}}|l\rangle^{\mathfrak{L}}|t\rangle^{\theta}$$
$$= F\Big(\psi^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta}_{j,l,t}, |\zeta_{j,l,t}\rangle\langle\zeta_{j,l,t}|^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n}$$
$$\otimes |j\rangle\langle j|^{\mathfrak{M}} \otimes |l\rangle\langle l|^{\mathfrak{L}} \otimes |t\rangle\langle t|^{\theta}\Big)$$
$$\geq 1 - \epsilon \ . \tag{78}$$

2) Building the seconder part of the decoding operator

Define

$$|a_{j,l}\rangle^{\mathfrak{P}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta} := |\varkappa_{j,l}\rangle^{\mathfrak{P}^n}|0\rangle^{\mathfrak{M}}|0\rangle^{\mathfrak{L}}|0\rangle^{\theta} \ ,$$

and

$$|b_{j,l,t}\rangle^{\mathfrak{P}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta} := \left(U_{N_t} \otimes id^{\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta}\right)^*\left(id^{\mathfrak{E}^n} \otimes V^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta}\right)^*$$
$$|\zeta_{j,l,t}\rangle^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n}|j\rangle^{\mathfrak{M}}|l\rangle^{\mathfrak{L}}|t\rangle^{\theta} \ .$$

For every j, l, and t, we have $\langle a_{j,l}|b_{j,l,t}\rangle^{\mathfrak{P}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta} \geq 1 - \epsilon$.

Define

$$|\hat{a}_{j,k}\rangle^{\mathfrak{P}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{L_n}}\sum_{l=1}^{L_n} e^{2\pi i l\frac{k}{L_n}}|a_{j,l}\rangle^{\mathfrak{P}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta} \ ,$$

$$|\hat{b}_{j,k,t}\rangle^{\mathfrak{P}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{L_n}}\sum_{l=1}^{L_n} e^{2\pi i l\frac{k}{L_n}}|b_{j,l,t}\rangle^{\mathfrak{P}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta} \ ,$$

and

$$|\overline{b}_{j,k}\rangle^{\mathfrak{P}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta} := \frac{1}{|\theta|}\sum_{t=1}^{|\theta|}|\hat{b}_{j,k,t}\rangle^{\mathfrak{P}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta} \ .$$

For every $j \in \{1, \cdots, J_n\}$, by (78) it holds

$$\frac{1}{L_n}\sum_{k=1}^{L_n}\langle\hat{a}_{j,k}|\overline{b}_{j,k}\rangle^{\mathfrak{P}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta}$$
$$= \frac{1}{|\theta|}\frac{1}{L_n}\sum_{t=1}^{|\theta|}\sum_{k=1}^{L_n}\langle\hat{a}_{j,k}|\hat{b}_{j,k,t}\rangle^{\mathfrak{P}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta}$$
$$= \frac{1}{|\theta|}\frac{1}{L_n}\sum_{t=1}^{|\theta|}\sum_{l=1}^{L_n}\langle a_{j,l}|b_{j,l,t}\rangle^{\mathfrak{P}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta}$$
$$\geq 1 - \epsilon \ . \tag{79}$$

Hence there is at least one $k_j \in \{1, \cdots, L_n\}$ such that for every j, we have

$$1 - \epsilon$$
$$\leq e^{is_{k_j}}\langle\hat{a}_{j,k_j}|\overline{b}_{j,k_j}\rangle^{\mathfrak{P}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta}$$
$$= \frac{1}{|\theta|}\sum_{t=1}^{|\theta|} e^{is_{k_j}}\langle\hat{a}_{j,k_j}|\hat{b}_{j,k_j,t}\rangle^{\mathfrak{P}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta} \ ,$$

for a suitable phase s_{k_j}. Since for all t it holds $\left|e^{is_{k_j}}\langle\hat{a}_{j,k_j}|\hat{b}_{j,k_j,t}\rangle^{\mathfrak{P}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta}\right| \leq 1$, we have

$$\min_{t\in\theta}\left|e^{is_{k_j}}\langle\hat{a}_{j,k_j}|\hat{b}_{j,k_j,t}\rangle^{\mathfrak{P}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta}\right| \geq 1 - |\theta|\epsilon \ .$$

Therefore, there is a suitable phase r_{k_j} such that for all $t \in \theta$,

$$1 - |\theta|\epsilon$$
$$\leq \left|e^{is_{k_j}}\langle\hat{a}_{j,k_j}|\hat{b}_{j,k_j,t}\rangle^{\mathfrak{P}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta}\right|$$
$$= e^{ir_{k_j}}\langle\hat{a}_{j,k_j}|\hat{b}_{j,k_j,t}\rangle^{\mathfrak{P}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta}$$
$$= e^{ir_{k_j}}\frac{1}{L_n}\left(\sum_{l=1}^{L_n} e^{2\pi i l\frac{k_j}{L_n}}\langle a_{j,l}|^{\mathfrak{P}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta}\right)$$
$$\left(\sum_{l=1}^{L_n} e^{2\pi i l\frac{k_j}{L_n}}|b_{j,l,t}\rangle^{\mathfrak{P}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta}\right) \ . \tag{80}$$

For every $t \in \theta$, we set

$$|\varpi_{j,t}\rangle^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n\mathfrak{L}} := \sqrt{\frac{1}{L_n}}\sum_{l=1}^{L_n} e^{2\pi i(l\frac{k_j}{L_n}+r_{k_j})}|\zeta_{j,l,t}\rangle^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n} \otimes |l\rangle^{\mathfrak{L}}$$

and

$$|\vartheta_{j,t}\rangle^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta} := \sqrt{\frac{1}{L_n}}\sum_{l=1}^{L_n} e^{2\pi i l\frac{k_j}{L_n}}\left[id^{\mathfrak{E}^n} \otimes V^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta}\right]$$
$$(U_N^{\otimes n}|\varkappa_{j,l}\rangle^{\mathfrak{P}^n})|0\rangle^{\mathfrak{M}}|0\rangle^{\mathfrak{L}}|0\rangle^{\theta} \ .$$

For all $t \in \theta$ and $j \in \{1, \cdots J_n\}$ it holds by (80)

$$F\Big(|\vartheta_{j,t}\rangle\langle\vartheta_{j,t}|^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta},$$
$$|\varpi_{j,t}\rangle\langle\varpi_{j,t}|^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n\mathfrak{L}}\otimes|j\rangle\langle j|^{\mathfrak{M}}\otimes|t\rangle\langle t|^{\theta}\Big)$$
$$=\left|\langle\vartheta_{j,t}|^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta}|\varpi_{j,t}\rangle^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n\mathfrak{L}}|j\rangle^{M}|t\rangle^{\theta}\right|$$
$$=\frac{1}{L_n}\left(\sum_{l=1}^{L_n}e^{2\pi il\frac{k_j}{L_n}}\langle a_{j,l}|^{\mathfrak{P}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta}\right)$$
$$\left(\sum_{l=1}^{L_n}e^{2\pi il\frac{k_j}{L_n}}e^{ir_{k_j}}|b_{j,l,t}\rangle^{\mathfrak{P}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta}\right)$$
$$\geq 1-|\theta|\epsilon\ . \tag{81}$$

Furthermore, since (76) holds there is a quantum state $\xi_t^{\mathfrak{E}^n}$, which does not depend on j ant l, on $H^{\mathfrak{E}^n}$ such that

$$\left\|\xi_t^{\mathfrak{E}^n}-\mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{Q}^n}\left(U_{N_t}|\varkappa_{j,l}\rangle\langle\varkappa_{j,l}|^{\mathfrak{P}^n}U_{N_t}^*\right)\right\|_1\leq\epsilon\ . \tag{82}$$

By monotonicity of fidelity, for any $l\in\{1,\cdots,L_n\}$

$$\left\|\mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{Q}^n}\left(U_{N_t}|\varkappa_{j,l}\rangle\langle\varkappa_{j,l}|^{\mathfrak{P}^n}U_{N_t}^*\right)-\mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{Q}^n}\left(|\zeta_{j,l,t}\rangle\langle\zeta_{j,l,t}|^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n}\right)\right\|_1$$
$$\leq 2\Big[1-F\Big(\mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{Q}^n}\left(U_{N_t}|\varkappa_{j,l}\rangle\langle\varkappa_{j,l}|^{\mathfrak{P}^n}U_{N_t}^*\right),$$
$$\mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{Q}^n}\left(|\zeta_{j,l,t}\rangle\langle\zeta_{j,l,t}|^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n}\right)\Big)\Big]^{\frac{1}{2}}$$
$$\leq 2\Big[1-F\Big(\psi_{j,l,t}^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta},|\zeta_{j,l,t}\rangle\langle\zeta_{j,l,t}|^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n}$$
$$\otimes|j\rangle\langle j|^{\mathfrak{M}}\otimes|l\rangle\langle l|^{\mathfrak{L}}\otimes|t\rangle\langle t|^{\theta}\Big)\Big]^{\frac{1}{2}}$$
$$\leq 2\sqrt{\epsilon}\ , \tag{83}$$

the first inequality holds because for two quantum states ϱ and η, we have $\frac{1}{2}\|\varrho-\eta\|_1\leq\sqrt{1-F(\varrho,\eta)^2}$.

By (82) and (83)

$$\left\|\mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{L}}\left(|\varpi_{j,t}\rangle\langle\varpi_{j,t}|^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n\mathfrak{L}}\right)-\xi_t^{\mathfrak{E}^n}\right\|_1$$
$$=\left\|\frac{1}{L_n}\sum_{l=1}^{L_n}\mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{Q}^n}\left(|\zeta_{j,l,t}\rangle\langle\zeta_{j,l,t}|^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n}\right)-\xi_t^{\mathfrak{E}^n}\right\|_1$$
$$\leq\frac{1}{L_n}\sum_{l=1}^{L_n}\Big\|\mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{Q}^n}\left(U_{N_t}|\varkappa_{j,l}\rangle\langle\varkappa_{j,l}|^{\mathfrak{P}^n}U_{N_t}^*\right)$$
$$-\mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{Q}^n}\left(|\zeta_{j,l,t}\rangle\langle\zeta_{j,l,t}|^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n}\right)\Big\|_1$$
$$+\left\|\xi_t^{\mathfrak{E}^n}-\mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{Q}^n}\left(U_{N_t}|\varkappa_{j,l}\rangle\langle\varkappa_{j,l}|^{\mathfrak{P}^n}U_{N_t}^*\right)\right\|_1$$
$$\leq 2\sqrt{\epsilon}+\epsilon\ , \tag{84}$$

holds for all $t\in\theta$ and $j\in\{1,\cdots,J_n\}$.

In [23] (cf. also [13]) it was shown that when (84) holds, for every $t\in\theta$ we can find a unitary operator $U_{(t)}^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}}$ such that if we set

$$\chi_{j,t}^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}}:=\left(U_{(t)}^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}}\otimes id^{\mathfrak{E}^n}\right)$$
$$\left(|\varpi_{j,t}\rangle\langle\varpi_{j,t}|^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n\mathfrak{L}}\otimes|j\rangle\langle j|^{\mathfrak{M}}\right)\left(U_{(t)}^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}}\otimes id^{\mathfrak{E}^n}\right)^*\ ,$$

then

$$F\left(|\xi_t\rangle\langle\xi_t|^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n\mathfrak{L}}\otimes|j\rangle\langle j|^{\mathfrak{M}},\chi_{j,t}^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}}\right)\geq 1-4\epsilon-4\sqrt{\epsilon}\ , \tag{85}$$

where $|\xi_t\rangle^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n\mathfrak{L}}$ is chosen so such that $|\xi_t\rangle\langle\xi_t|^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n\mathfrak{L}}$ is a purification of $\xi_t^{\mathfrak{E}^n}$ on $H^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n\mathfrak{L}}$.

3) Defining the code

We can now define our entanglement generating code. Let t' be arbitrary in θ. The sender prepares the quantum state

$$\frac{1}{J_n}\frac{1}{L_n}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{J_n}\sum_{l=1}^{L_n}e^{2\pi il\frac{k_j}{L_n}}|\varkappa_{j,l}\rangle^{\mathfrak{P}^n}|j\rangle^{\mathfrak{A}}\right)$$
$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^{J_n}\sum_{l=1}^{L_n}e^{2\pi il\frac{k_j}{L_n}}\langle j|^{\mathfrak{A}}\langle\varkappa_{j,l}|^{\mathfrak{P}^n}\right)\ , \tag{86}$$

keeps the system $\mathfrak{A}$ and sends the system $\mathfrak{P}^n$ through the channel $N_{t'}^{\otimes n}$, i.e., the resulting quantum state is

$$\frac{1}{J_n}\frac{1}{L_n}\left(id^{\mathfrak{A}}\otimes U_{N_{t'}}^{\otimes n}\right)\Bigg[\left(\sum_{j=1}^{J_n}\sum_{l=1}^{L_n}e^{2\pi il\frac{k_j}{L_n}}|j\rangle^{A}|\varkappa_{j,l}\rangle^{\mathfrak{P}^n}\right)$$
$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^{J_n}\sum_{l=1}^{L_n}e^{2\pi il\frac{k_j}{L_n}}\langle\varkappa_{j,l}|^{\mathfrak{P}^n}\langle j|^{\mathfrak{A}}\right)\Bigg]\left(id^{\mathfrak{A}}\otimes U_{N_{t'}}^{\otimes n}\right)^*$$
$$=\frac{1}{J_n}\frac{1}{L_n}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{J_n}|j\rangle^{\mathfrak{A}}\left(\sum_{l=1}^{L_n}e^{2\pi il\frac{k_j}{L_n}}U_{N_{t'}}^{\otimes n}|\varkappa_{j,l}\rangle^{\mathfrak{P}^n}\right)\right]$$
$$\left[\sum_{j=1}^{J_n}\left(\sum_{l=1}^{L_n}e^{2\pi il\frac{k_j}{L_n}}\langle\varkappa_{j,l}|^{\mathfrak{P}^n}(U_{N_{t'}}^{\otimes n})^*\right)\langle j|^{\mathfrak{A}}\right]\ .$$

The receiver subsequently applies the decoding operator

$$\tau^{\mathfrak{Q}^n}\to\mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{L}\theta}\Bigg[\left(\sum_{t\in\theta}U_{(t)}^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}}\otimes|t\rangle\langle t|^{\theta}\right)V^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta}$$
$$\left(\tau^{\mathfrak{Q}^n}\otimes|0\rangle\langle 0|^{\mathfrak{M}}\otimes|0\rangle\langle 0|^{\mathfrak{L}}\otimes|0\rangle\langle 0|^{\theta}\right)$$
$$V^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta *}\left(\sum_{t\in\theta}U_{(t)}^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}}\otimes|t\rangle\langle t|^{\theta}\right)^*\Bigg]\ , \tag{87}$$

on his outcome.

3.1) The resulting quantum state after performing the decoding operator

Define

$$\begin{aligned}
&\iota_{t'}^{\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta}\\
&:= \left(\sum_{t\in\theta} U_{(t)}^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}} \otimes id^{\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{E}^n} \otimes |t\rangle\langle t|^{\theta}\right)(V^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta} \otimes id^{\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{E}^n})\\
&\left(\frac{1}{J_n}\frac{1}{L_n}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{J_n} |j\rangle^{\mathfrak{A}} \left(\sum_{l=1}^{L_n} e^{2\pi i l\frac{k_j}{L_n}} U_{N_{t'}}^{\otimes n}|\varkappa_{j,l}\rangle^{P^n}\right)\right]\right.\\
&\left[\sum_{j=1}^{J_n}\left(\sum_{l=1}^{L_n} e^{2\pi i l\frac{k_j}{L_n}} \langle\varkappa_{j,l}|^{P^n}(U_{N_{t'}}^{\otimes n})^*\right)\langle j|^{\mathfrak{A}}\right]\\
&\left.\otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|^{\mathfrak{M}} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|^{\mathfrak{L}} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|^{\theta}\right)(V^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta} \otimes id^{\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{E}^n})^*\\
&\left(\sum_{t\in\theta} U_{(t)}^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}} \otimes id^{\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{E}^n} \otimes |t\rangle\langle t|^{\theta}\right)^*\\
&= \left(\sum_{t\in\theta} U_{(t)}^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}} \otimes id^{\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{E}^n} \otimes |t\rangle\langle t|^{\theta}\right)\\
&\left(\frac{1}{J_n}(\sum_{j=1}^{J_n} |j\rangle^{\mathfrak{A}}|\vartheta_{j,t'}\rangle^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta})(\sum_{j=1}^{J_n}\langle\vartheta_{j,t'}|^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta}\langle j|^{\mathfrak{A}})\right)\\
&\left(\sum_{t\in\theta} U_{(t)}^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}} \otimes id^{\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{E}^n} \otimes |t\rangle\langle t|^{\theta}\right)^* \ ,
\end{aligned} \tag{88}$$

then the resulting quantum state after performing the decoding operator is $\mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n\mathfrak{L}\theta}(\iota_{t'}^{\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta})$.

3.2) The fidelity of $\frac{1}{J_n}\sum_{j=1}^{J_n}\chi_{j,t'}^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}} \otimes |j\rangle\langle j|^{\mathfrak{A}} \otimes |t'\rangle\langle t'|^{\theta}$ and the actual quantum state

Because

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\sum_{t\in\theta} U_{(t)}^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}} \otimes id^{\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{E}^n} \otimes |t\rangle\langle t|^{\theta}\right)\\
&\left(\sum_{t\in\theta} U_{(t)}^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}} \otimes id^{\mathfrak{E}^n} \otimes |t\rangle\langle t|^{\theta}\right)^*\\
&= id^{\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{E}^n} \otimes \sum_{t\in\theta} U_{(t)}^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}}(U_{(t)}^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}})^* \otimes |t\rangle\langle t|^{\theta}\\
&= id^{\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta} \ ,
\end{aligned}$$

$\sum_{t\in\theta} U_{(t)}^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}} \otimes id^{\mathfrak{E}^n} \otimes |t\rangle\langle t|^{\theta}$ is unitary.

Because of this unitarity and by (81)

$$\begin{aligned}
&F\left(\iota_{t'}^{\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta}, \frac{1}{J_n}\sum_{j=1}^{J_n}\chi_{j,t'}^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}} \otimes |j\rangle\langle j|^{\mathfrak{A}} \otimes |t'\rangle\langle t'|^{\theta}\right)\\
&= F\left(\frac{1}{J_n}(\sum_{j=1}^{J_n} |j\rangle^{\mathfrak{A}}|\vartheta_{j,t'}\rangle^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta})(\sum_{j=1}^{J_n}\langle\vartheta_{j,t'}|^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta}\langle j|^{\mathfrak{A}}),\right.\\
&\frac{1}{J_n}(\sum_{j=1}^{J_n}|\varpi_{j,t'}\rangle^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n\mathfrak{L}} \otimes |j\rangle^{\mathfrak{A}} \otimes |j\rangle^{\mathfrak{M}})\\
&\left.(\sum_{j=1}^{J_n}\langle j|^{\mathfrak{M}} \otimes \langle j|^{\mathfrak{A}} \otimes \langle\varpi_{j,t'}|^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n\mathfrak{L}}) \otimes |t'\rangle\langle t'|^{\theta}\right)\\
&= \frac{1}{J_n}\left|\left(\sum_{j=1}^{J_n}\langle\vartheta_{j,t'}|^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta}\right)\right.\\
&\left.\left(\sum_{j=1}^{J_n}|\varpi_{j,t'}\rangle^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n\mathfrak{L}} \otimes |j\rangle^{\mathfrak{M}} \otimes |t'\rangle^{\theta}\right)\right|\\
&\geq 1 - |\theta|\epsilon \ .
\end{aligned} \tag{89}$$

3.3) The fidelity of $\frac{1}{J_n}\sum_{j=1}^{J_n}\chi_{j,t'}^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}} \otimes |j\rangle\langle j|^{\mathfrak{A}} \otimes |t'\rangle\langle t'|^{\theta}$ and the standard maximally entanglement state

By (85) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&F\left(\frac{1}{J_n}\sum_{j=1}^{J_n}\chi_{j,t'}^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}} \otimes |t'\rangle\langle t'|^{\theta} \otimes |j\rangle\langle j|^{\mathfrak{A}},\right.\\
&\left.\frac{1}{J_n}\sum_{j=1}^{J_n}|\xi_{t'}\rangle\langle\xi_{t'}|^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n\mathfrak{L}} \otimes |j\rangle\langle j|^{\mathfrak{A}} \otimes |j\rangle\langle j|^{\mathfrak{M}} \otimes |t'\rangle\langle t'|^{\theta}\right)\\
&\geq 1 - 4\epsilon - 4\sqrt{\epsilon} \ .
\end{aligned} \tag{90}$$

3.4) The fidelity of the actual quantum state and the standard maximally entanglement state

Since for two quantum states ϱ and η, it holds

$$1 - F(\varrho,\eta) \leq \frac{1}{2}\|\varrho - \eta\|_1 \leq \sqrt{1 - F(\varrho,\eta)^2} \ ,$$

for three quantum states ϱ, η, and υ, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&F(\varrho,\eta)\\
&\geq 1 - \frac{1}{2}\|\varrho - \eta\|_1\\
&\geq 1 - \frac{1}{2}\|\varrho - \upsilon\|_1 - \frac{1}{2}\|\upsilon - \eta\|_1\\
&\geq 1 - \sqrt{1 - F(\varrho,\upsilon)^2} - \sqrt{1 - F(\upsilon,\eta)^2} \ .
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (89) and (90), for all $t' \in \theta$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&F\left(\mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n\mathfrak{L}\theta}(\iota_{t'}^{\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta}), \sum_{j=1}^{J_n}|j\rangle\langle j|^{\mathfrak{A}} \otimes |j\rangle\langle j|^{\mathfrak{M}}\right)\\
&\geq F\left(\iota_{t'}^{\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{L}\theta}, \frac{1}{J_n}\sum_{j=1}^{J_n}|\xi_{t'}\rangle\langle\xi_{t'}|^{\mathfrak{Q}^n\mathfrak{E}^n\mathfrak{L}}\right.\\
&\left.\otimes |j\rangle\langle j|^{\mathfrak{A}} \otimes |j\rangle\langle j|^{\mathfrak{M}} \otimes |t'\rangle\langle t'|^{\theta}\right)\\
&\geq 1 - \sqrt{2|\theta|\epsilon - |\theta|^2\epsilon^2} - \sqrt{8\sqrt{\epsilon} - 16\epsilon^2 - 32\epsilon\sqrt{\epsilon} - 8\epsilon}
\end{aligned} \tag{91}$$

$$\geq 1 - \sqrt{2|\theta|}\sqrt{\epsilon} - \sqrt{8}\sqrt[4]{\epsilon} \ . \tag{92}$$

This means that if n is large enough, then for any positive δ and ϵ, there is an $(n, \sqrt{2|\theta|}\sqrt{\epsilon} + \sqrt{8}\sqrt[4]{\epsilon})$ code with rate

$$\min_t \chi(X;Q_t) - \max_t \chi(X;E_t) - 2\delta \ .$$

∎

Proposition 1: The entanglement generating capacity of $(N_t)_{t\in\theta}$ with CSI at the encoder is

$$A_{CSI} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \min_{t\in\theta} \max_{\rho\in\mathcal{S}(H)^{\mathfrak{Q}^n}} I_C(\rho; {N_t}^{\otimes n}) \ . \qquad (93)$$

Proof: As being shown in [11], after receiving a dummy code word as the first block, the sender also can have the CSI. Then we have the case where both the sender and the receiver has the CSI. But this case is just equivalent to the case when we only have one channel (N_t), instead of a family of channels $\{(N_t) : t = 1, \cdots, |\theta|\}$, and we may assume it is the worst channel. The bits that we use to detect the CSI is large but constant, so it is negligible compared to the rest. By [13] the entanglement generating capacity of the quantum channel N_t is

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \max_{\rho\in\mathcal{S}(H)^{\mathfrak{Q}^n}} I_C(\rho; N_t^{\otimes n}) \ .$$

The proof of the converse is similar to those given in the proof of Theorem 2, where we consider a worst t'. ■

Proposition 2: The entanglement generating capacity of $(N_t)_{t\in\theta}$ with feedback is bounded as follows

$$A_{feed} \geq \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \min_{t\in\theta} \max_{\rho\in\mathcal{S}(H)^{\mathfrak{Q}^n}} I_C(\rho; {N_t}^{\otimes n}) \ . \qquad (94)$$

Proof: As we shown in Section IV, the receiver can detect the channel state t correctly after receiving a dummy word as the first block. Then he can send t back to the sender via feedback. ■

Remark 7: For a one-way entanglement distillation protocol using secret key, see [14]. For arbitrarily varying classical-quantum wiretap channel, which is a generalization of compound classical-quantum wiretap channels, see [10].

VII. FURTHER NOTES

Let $\mathfrak{P}$, $\mathfrak{Q}$, $H^{\mathfrak{P}}$, and $H^{\mathfrak{Q}}$ be defined as in Section II. Let N be a quantum channel $\mathcal{S}(H^{\mathfrak{P}}) \to \mathcal{S}(H^{\mathfrak{Q}})$. In general, there are two ways to represent a quantum channel, i. e. a completely positive trace preserving map $\mathcal{S}(H^{\mathfrak{P}}) \to \mathcal{S}(H^{\mathfrak{Q}})$, with linear algebraic tools.

1. Operator Sum Decomposition (Kraus Representation)

$$N(\rho) = \sum_{i=1}^{K} A_i \rho {A_i}^* \ , \qquad (95)$$

where $A_1, \cdots, A_K$ (Kraus operators) are linear operators $\mathcal{S}(H^{\mathfrak{P}}) \to \mathcal{S}(H^{\mathfrak{Q}})$ (cf.[17], [3], and [20]). They satisfy the completeness relation $\sum_{i=1}^{K} {A_i}^* A_i = id_{H^{\mathfrak{P}}}$. The representation of a quantum channel N according (95) is not unique. Let $A_1, \cdots, A_K$ and $B_1, \cdots, B_{K'}$ be two sets of Kraus operators (by appending zero operators to the shorter list of operation elements we may ensure that $K' = K$). Suppose $A_1, \cdots, A_K$ represents N, then $B_1, \cdots, B_K$ also represents N if and only if there exist a $K \times K$ unitary matrix $(u_{i,j})_{i,j=1,\cdots,K}$ such that for all i we have $A_i = \sum_{j=1}^{K} u_{i,j} B_j$ (cf. [20]).

2. Isometric Extension (Stinespring Dilation)

$$N(\rho) = \mathrm{tr}_{\mathfrak{E}} \left(U_N \rho U_N^*\right) \ , \qquad (96)$$

where U_N is a linear operator $\mathcal{S}(H^{\mathfrak{P}}) \to \mathcal{S}(H^{\mathfrak{Q}\mathfrak{E}})$ such that $U_N^* U_N = id_{H^{\mathfrak{P}}}$, and $\mathfrak{E}$ is the quantum system of the environment (cf. [24], [3], and also [25] for a more general Stinespring Dilation Theorem). $H^{\mathfrak{E}}$ can be chosen such that $\dim H^{\mathfrak{E}} \leq (\dim H^{\mathfrak{P}})^2$. The isometric extension of a quantum channel N according (96) is neither unique. Let U and U' be two linear operators $\mathcal{S}(H^{\mathfrak{P}}) \to \mathcal{S}(H^{\mathfrak{Q}\mathfrak{E}})$. Suppose U represents N, then U' also represents N if and only if U and U' are unitarily equivalent.

We can reduce each of these two representations of quantum channel from the other one. Let $A_1, \cdots, A_K$ be a set of Kraus operators which represents N. Let $\{|j\rangle^{\mathfrak{E}} : j = 1, \cdots, K\}$ be an orthonormal system on $H^{\mathfrak{E}}$, Then $U_N = \sum_{j=1}^{K} A_j \otimes |j\rangle^{\mathfrak{E}}$ is an isometric extension which represents N, since $\left(\sum_{j=1}^{K} A_j \otimes |j\rangle^{\mathfrak{E}}\right) \rho \left(\sum_{k=1}^{K} A_k \otimes |k\rangle^{\mathfrak{E}}\right)^* = \sum_{j=1}^{K} A_j \rho {A_j}^*$ and $\left(\sum_{j=1}^{K} A_j \otimes |j\rangle^{\mathfrak{E}}\right)^* \left(\sum_{k=1}^{K} A_k \otimes |k\rangle^{\mathfrak{E}}\right) = \sum_{j=1}^{K} {A_j}^* A_j$. On the other way round, every isometric extension U_N that represents N can be write in form $U_N = \sum_{j=1}^{K} A_j \otimes |j\rangle^{\mathfrak{E}}$, i.e. if the sender sends ρ, and if the environment's measurement gives $|i\rangle^{\mathfrak{E}}$, the receiver's outcome will be $A_i \rho {A_i}^*$. Here $A_1, \cdots, A_K$ is a set of Kraus operators which represents N, and $\{|j\rangle^{\mathfrak{E}} : j = 1, \cdots, K\}$ is an orthonormal system on $H^{\mathfrak{E}}$.

Using either of both methods to represent a quantum channel, one can show that (cf. [4] and [13]) the entanglement generating capacity of a quantum channel N is

$$\mathcal{A}(N) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \max_{\rho\in\mathcal{S}(H)^{\mathfrak{Q}^n}} I_C(\rho; N^{\otimes n}) \ . \qquad (97)$$

The advantage of the Kraus representation is that it describes the dynamics of the principal system without having to explicitly consider properties of the environment, whose dynamics are often unimportant. All that we need to know is the system of the receiver alone, this simplifies calculations. In [16] an explicit construction of a quantum error correction code (both perfect and approximate information recovery) with the Kraus operators is given. The main disadvantage of the Kraus representation is that the set of Kraus operators is not unique. The reason is that the choice of orthonormal system $\{|j\rangle^{\mathfrak{E}} : j = 1, \cdots, K\}$ is not unique, and it is much more difficult to check if two sets of Kraus operators represent the same quantum channel than to check if two isometric extensions represent the same quantum channel.

In the Stinespring dilation, we have a natural interpretation of the system of the environment. From the Stinespring dilation, we can conclude that the receiver can detect almost all quantum information if and only if the channel releases almost no information to the environment. In [23] an alternative way to build a quantum error correction code (both perfect and approximate information recovery) using this fact is given. The disadvantage is that we suppose it is suboptimal for calculating the entanglement generating capacity of a compound quantum channel without CSI at the encoder.

In [7] the entanglement generating capacity for compound quantum channel is determined, using a quantum error correction code of [16], which is built by Kraus operators. Their result is the following. The entanglement generating capacity of a quantum wiretap channel $N = (N_t)_{t\in\theta}$ is

$$\mathcal{A}(N) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \max_{\rho\in\mathcal{S}(H)^{\mathfrak{Q}^n}} \min_{t\in\theta} I_C(\rho; {N_t}^{\otimes n}) \ . \qquad (98)$$

This result is stronger than our result in Theorem 3. This is due to the fact that we use for our proof a quantum error correction code of [23], which is based upon the Stinespring dilation. If we use the Kraus operators to represent a compound quantum channel, we have a bipartite system, and for calculating the entanglement generating capacity of a compound quantum channel, we can use the technique which is similar to the case of a single quantum channel. However, if we use the Stinespring dilation to represent a compound quantum channel, we have a tripartite system, which includes the sender, the receiver, and in addition the environment. Unlike in the case of a single quantum channel, for compound quantum channel we have to deal with uncertainty at the environment. If the sender knows the CSI, the transmitters can build an (n, ϵ) code for entanglement generating with rate $\min_t [\chi(X; Q_t) - \chi(X; E_t)] - \delta = \min_{t\in\theta} I_C(\rho; N_t) - \delta$ (Proposition 1) for any positive δ and ϵ. This result is optimal (cf. [7]). But if the sender does not know the CSI, he has to build an encoding operator by considering every possible channel state for the environment. Therefore the maximal rate what we can achieve is $\min_t \chi(X; Q_t) - \max_t \chi(X; E_t)$, but not $\min_{t\in\theta} I_C(\rho; N_t) = \min_t [\chi(X; Q_t) - \chi(X; E_t)]$. This is only a lower bound of the entanglement generating capacity. It is unknown if we can achieve the stronger result (98) using Stinespring dilation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Supports by the Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung (BMBF) via grant 16BQ1050 and 16BQ1052, and the National Natural Science Foundation of China via grant 61271174 are gratefully acknowledged.

REFERENCES

[1] R. Ahlswede, Elimination of correlation in random codes for arbitrarily varying channels, Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verw. Geb., Vol. 44, 159185, 1978.
[2] R. Ahlswede and A. Winter, Strong converse for identification via quantum channels, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, Vol. 48, No. 3, 569-579, 2002. Addendum: IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, Vol. 49, No. 1, 346, 2003.
[3] H. Barnum, M. A. Nielsen, and B. Schumacher, Information transmission through a noisy quantum channel, Phys. Rev. A, Vol. 57, 4153 , 1998.
[4] C. H. Bennett, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, and A. V. Thapliyal, Entanglement-assisted capacity of a quantum channel and the reverse Shannon theorem. IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, Vol. 48, 2637-2655, 2002.
[5] I. Bjelaković and H. Boche, Classical capacities of averaged and compound quantum channels. IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, Vol. 57, No. 7, 3360-3374, 2009.
[6] I. Bjelaković, H. Boche, and J. Nötzel, Entanglement transmission and generation under channel uncertainty: universal quantum channel coding, Communications in Mathematical Physics, Vol. 292, No. 1, 55-97, 2009.
[7] I. Bjelaković, H. Boche, and J. Nötzel, Entanglement transmission capacity of compound channels, Proc. of International Symposium on Information Theory ISIT 2009, Korea, 2009.
[8] I. Bjelakovic, H. Boche, and J. Sommerfeld, Capacity results for compound wiretap channels, Problems of Information Transmission, 2011.
[9] D. Blackwell, L. Breiman, and A. J. Thomasian, The capacity of a class of channels, Ann. Math. Stat. Vol. 30, No. 4, 1229-1241, 1959.
[10] V. Blinovsky and M. Cai, Classical-quantum arbitrarily varying wiretap channel, H. Aydinian, F. Cicalese, and C. Deppe (Eds.), Ahlswede Festschrift, LNCS 7777, 234-246, 3013.
[11] M. Cai and N. Cai, Channel state detecting code for compound quantum channel, preprint.
[12] N. Cai, A. Winter, and R. W. Yeung, Quantum privacy and quantum wiretap channels, Problems of Information Transmission, Vol. 40, No. 4, 318-336, 2004.
[13] I. Devetak, The private classical information capacity and quantum information capacity of a quantum channel, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, Vol. 51, No. 1, 44-55, 2005.
[14] I. Devetak and A. Winter, Distillation of secret key and entanglement from quantum states, Proc. R. Soc. A, Vol. 461, 207-235, 2005.
[15] S. Holevo, Statistical problems in quantum physics, Proceedings of the second Japan-USSR Symposium on Probability Theory, ser. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, G. Maruyama and J. V. Prokhorov, Eds., Vol. 330, 104-119, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1973.
[16] R. Klesse, Approximate quantum error correction, random codes, and quantum channel capacity, Phys. Rev. A 75, 062315, 2007.
[17] K. Kraus, States, Effects, and Operations, Springer, Berlin, 1983.
[18] Y. Liang, G. Kramer, H. Poor, and S. Shamai, Compound wiretap channels, EURASIP Journal on Wireless Communications and Networking, Article ID 142374, 2008.
[19] V. D. Milman and G. Schechtman, Asymptotic Theory of Finite Dimensional Normed Spaces. Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1200, Springer-Verlag, corrected second printing, Berlin, UK, 2001.
[20] M. Nielsen and I. Chuang, Quantum Computation and Quantum Information, Cambridge University Press, 2000.
[21] V. Paulsen, Completely Bounded Maps and Operator Algebras, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics 78, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2002.
[22] B. Schumacher and M. A. Nielsen, Quantum data processing and error correction, Phys. Rev. A, Vol. 54, 2629, 1996.
[23] B. Schumacher and M. D. Westmoreland, Approximate quantum error correction, Quant. Inf. Proc., Vol. 1, No. 8, 5-12, 2002.
[24] P. W. Shor, The quantum channel capacity and coherent information, lecture notes, MSRI Workshop on Quantum Computation, 2002.
[25] W. F. Stinespring, Positive functions on C*-algebras, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., Vol. 6, 211, 1955.
[26] S. Watanabe, Private and quantum capacities of more capable and less noisy quantum channels, Phys. Rev., A 85, 012326, 2012.
[27] M. Wilde, From Classical to Quantum Shannon Theory, arXiv:1106-1445, 2011.
[28] A. Winter, Coding theorem and strong converse for quantum channels, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, Vol. 45, No. 7, 2481-2485, 1999.
[29] A. D. Wyner, The wire-tap channel, Bell System Technical Journal, Vol. 54, No. 8, 1355-1387, 1975.